

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

APRIL, 1868.

ART. I.—THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S
DESPATCHES.

Despatches, Correspondence, and Memoranda of Field-Marshal Arthur, Duke of Wellington, K.G. (In continuation of the former series.) Vols. I. and II.; January, 1819, to December, 1825. London: John Murray.

THE Duke of Wellington had conquered the conqueror of Europe, and sheathed his sword for life in the forty-sixth year of his age. Then he commenced a civil career of transcendent influence and no small glory, which lasted for thirty-seven years, and which knew little diminution of power to the end. The Queen has said of him very truly:—" His position was the highest a subject ever had,—above party,—looked up to by all,—revered by the whole nation,—the friend of the sovereign ;—and *how* simply he carried those honours ! " * This was his position when he died, and it had been the same throughout the whole course of her reign and of her uncles'. Warwick made kings; Wellington (a much more important and not less difficult task in these days !) made ministers. When the greatest of modern ministerial crises occurred, he took the seals of all the offices, and conducted for as long as was necessary the whole policy of the State himself. During all those years, nothing was considered too great to be subject to his capacity, nothing too small to exercise his skill. He turns from counselling sovereigns and statesmen to settle the point of honour in a duel, or the proper range of an Irish police patrol. When George the Fourth would not hear of Mr. Canning as Foreign Minister, the Duke alone could prevail on perverse Majesty to change its angry mood. When Prince Albert was puzzled what to do with the sparrows which

* *Leaves from the Journal of our Life in the Highlands*, p. 137.
VOL. X.—NO. XX. [New Series.] x

persisted in remaining on the trees which were enclosed in the original Crystal Palace, the Duke was sent for, and very simply suggested that they should be netted. In the course of ten pages in one of these volumes of his Despatches we find a succinct but exhaustive memorandum on the relations of Russia and Turkey, with special reference to the government of the Principalities ; one on the proper way of keeping the accounts of barracks and military stores ; one giving in most minute detail the order, with three different lines of route, in which carriages going to the Irish Ball in the Hay-market should set down and return ; one on the comparative cost of the Diplomatic Service in 1793 and in 1822 ; an interesting letter on the state of Ireland ; and one on a new Prussian method of fortification, which was then exciting military curiosity, but which the Duke at once guessed to be only a modification of Carnot's system.* To everything he applied himself with the same prompt readiness, the same simple gravity, the same inexorable insight, the same shrewd and solid sense. The same easy energy characterized him whether he was delivering the decisive blow of a great battle, or insisting that the cook at his Club should provide the needy subaltern's mutton-chop for seven-pence.

The correspondence of this great personage naturally became a sort of historical reservoir ; and in this point of view it is no exaggeration to say that it forms by far the most important and valuable book of its kind that has ever been published in England—a book nevertheless which has hardly been appreciated or studied, as it deserves, hitherto. It is not so much by the magnitude or variety of its materials, marvellous as these are, that we are to estimate its use and interest, as by their sterling character. The most eminent persons in Europe communicated with the Duke, and moreover they communicated with him with a peculiar degree of confidence and freedom. This was due partly to the superiority of his character, and partly to the quality of his intellect. The "haughty modesty," the self-suppressing dignity, the nice veneration for his word of honour, which he had always manifested, compelled the confidence of those who dealt with him ; and his large and penetrating mind, his immense experience of men and affairs, his own simple and cogent style, exacted that whatever was communicated to him should be real in its substance and to the point. Therefore kings wrote to him as to a friend, and the ministers who advised

* Vol. i. p. 232, *et seq.*

kings, sought his advice. There was no great topic of his time of which he was not a great part; and upon which the sources of all sorts of knowledge were not open to him. The history of Europe, but especially of France, Spain, Italy, Russia, and Turkey, is as much illustrated by these documents as that of England or Ireland; and many sections of already written contemporary history will have to be re-written by the curious cross lights which they afford. To take only the two volumes now under consideration, it is obvious from them that it was hitherto impossible to understand the true history of the Congress of Verona, or of the progress of the Catholic Question to such sudden success, or of the origin and early history of that cosmopolitan movement, which is now called the Revolution, or of the policy of Russia in the East during the reign of the Emperor Alexander, or of the gradual dissolution of the Holy Alliance, or even of the curiously entangled state of political parties in England during the reign of George the Fourth. The student is sustained in his reliance on this magazine of historical materials by a sense of the perfect honesty with which the present Duke has discharged his duty as Editor. The work might have been better arranged and indexed, perhaps. Even in this respect, however, it may be favourably contrasted with that work, which of all others will be most naturally compared with it, the *Correspondance de Napoléon 1^{er}*; in the later volumes of which the same good faith has certainly not been kept with history.

A simple but suggestive instance of the historical value of these volumes is afforded by referring to one or two brilliant blunders into which Sir Henry Bulwer, in his lately published memoir of Canning, has fallen, through the inexplicable negligence of not looking for information where he ought to have known he was certain to find it. The volume of the Duke's correspondence, which would have helped Sir Henry, had been published at least a year before his *Historical Characters* went to press. Every reader of that book will remember the amusing account which it gives of the way in which the consent of George the Fourth to Mr. Canning's appointment as Foreign Secretary was gained by the Duke of Wellington. The details of that transaction are of enduring historical interest. The accession of Mr. Canning to office at that particular moment changed, though not very obviously for a little time, the whole course of English affairs. It precipitated the emancipation of the Irish Catholics. On the other hand, it launched England into the new and rather revolutionary foreign policy, which Lord Palmerston subsequently

developed to such extreme lengths. This then is Sir Henry Bulwer's account of the event:—

Lord Liverpool was in a peculiar position. He agreed with the Conservatives as to the Catholic Emancipation question, but with Mr. Canning on all other questions. His policy, therefore, was to rule a pretty equally balanced Cabinet, and not to have one half too strong for the other. With this object he had lately admitted two or three followers of Lord Grenville, who, though himself retired from affairs, had still a party favourable to Catholic Emancipation, and hostile to constitutional innovations. For the same reason he now insisted on the necessity of offering the Secretaryship of Foreign Affairs to Mr. Canning, and impressed his opinions on this subject so strongly on the Duke of Wellington, that the Duke undertook to see his Majesty, and overcome the objections which (having never forgiven the minister who had deserted him, as he said, at the Queen's trial) he was certain to make to Mr. Canning's appointment. Two or three phrases of the conversation that took place on this occasion have been repeated to me by one who was at that time the confidant of both the King and the Duke.

"Good God! Arthur, you don't mean to propose that fellow to me as Secretary for Foreign Affairs; it is impossible. I said, on my honour as a gentleman, he should never be one of my ministers again. You hear, Arthur, on my honour as a gentleman. I am sure you will agree with me. I can't do what I said, on my honour as a gentleman, I would not do."

"Pardon me, sir, I don't agree with you at all; your Majesty is not a gentleman."

The King started.

"Your Majesty, I say," continued the imperturbable soldier, "is not a gentleman, but the sovereign of England, with duties to your people far above any to yourself; and these duties render it imperative that you should at this time employ the abilities of Mr. Canning."

"Well!" drawing a long breath, "If I must, I must," was finally the King's reply.

Now this story is merely a myth; an excellent myth, no doubt, for it conveys in the form of myth the very essence of the transaction. It is true that the Duke persuaded the King to receive Mr. Canning into his cabinet, and one of the strongest arguments which he used was that the King ought not to consider his private feelings where his duty as sovereign was concerned. But the very dramatic scene in which all this is supposed to have passed, is as much an invention as any scene in a comedy. The Duke never saw the King on the subject of Mr. Canning's appointment at all. The King was in Scotland when Lord Londonderry's terrible death occurred. When he returned to London the Duke was very ill—so ill that he was unable to leave his room until after the affair of Mr. Canning's appointment had been settled. All that passed was by way of correspondence; and the numerous letters on the subject are

spread over the period of a month, from the 13th of August to the 13th of September, 1822. The King's letters contain repeated expressions of grief at his "dear friend's" indisposition, and entreaties that he will not "leave his room at any hazard." In his Majesty's last letter, announcing that "the affair respecting Canning may be considered as concluded," he begins by saying, "I am glad to find by my friend that you are better to-day; and I hope and trust that the indisposition is nearly over;" and he then refers to some check in the negotiation, which had led to three or four days' delay and correspondence, as an affair "which you or I should have settled in five minutes,"—meaning manifestly five minutes' conversation. Thus it is clear that the King and the Duke never had any conversation on the subject until all was arranged. The difficulty with which the King yielded is almost despairingly expressed in this last letter. "Thus ends the last calamity;" he says, "my reliance is on you, my friend. Be watchful therefore. God bless you." This is very fine. The Duke had persuaded his Majesty to do that which was the most repugnant of all things to him; and he had only secured to himself more consideration and confidence thereby. He had let loose the deluge, and now he was to steer the ark. The Premier had already written to him—"I am most truly sensible of the value of your services and assistance upon this important crisis, without which it never might have been brought to such a result." But the result was by no means produced by sudden, skilful scalade of the King's consent. On the contrary, it was an affair of sapping and mining, finessing, manœuvring, and parleying. To the world the Duke was iron; to the Crown, India-rubber. No Spanish grandee, no Daimio of Japan, could be so subservient to his Sovereign, when it suited his purpose; but, be it said, his purpose was always, according to his lights, the good of his Sovereign; and, if he stooped, it was on the implied condition that he conquered.

The Duke was on his way to the Continent when he heard of Lord Londonderry's death. Lord Liverpool wrote at once to the King, entreating him not to make any arrangement for the Foreign Office until he came back from Scotland; and he employed Lord Fitzroy Somerset to urge the Duke's immediate return to London. That Mr. Canning should have the seals of the Foreign Office, and the Duke attend the Congress in Lord Londonderry's stead, was simply the one efficient solution possible of the difficulties in which the Government was placed. The influence of England, as the greatest of the Great Powers, had gradually drifted away

from the position which she had occupied at the Peace of Paris; and an occasion had now arisen on which it needed to be asserted with ability and with authority. Kings and Ministers were already moving all over Europe towards the gates of Verona. Again, the Government was wretchedly weak in the House of Commons, and Mr. Canning was the ablest member of the House of Commons. Mr. Peel, the next to him on his side in point of standing, knew nothing of foreign affairs, and could not even speak French. Mr. Canning was a man of genius, and he knew everything more or less; besides he had spent his two last years of reclusion from office in the Gironde, so that French was now a habit of the tongue to him. He was, however, on the point of going to India as Governor-General. The reason of his banishment to the great Satrapy was not merely that the King disliked him, but that Lord Londonderry and he had never pulled together in public business; and until the hour of Lord Londonderry's collapse, his had been the weightiest influence in the Cabinet. But that had all come to what a catastrophe. And now to Lord Liverpool it was vital that Mr. Canning should succeed; and obvious that the Duke of Wellington alone could induce the King to consent; and the Duke undertook the task.

His Grace approached his Majesty in an attitude of deep humility, hardly venturing to take the liberty of sympathy. "I know," he writes, "how much your Majesty regarded Lord Londonderry, and how sensible your Majesty was of his merits, of his attachment to your Majesty's person, and of the value of his services to your government; and his loss at the present moment is certainly one of the severest calamities that could befall your Majesty's kingdom." The whole letter consists of five sentences. The word *Majesty* occurs in it fifteen times. The third sentence is a stroke of flattery of the kind that gratifies all kings, but was peculiarly captivating to George the Fourth. "The feelings of your Majesty," it says, "upon this occasion must have been aggravated by the circumstances attending it, and by the fact that your Majesty had the misfortune of observing that that great mind was in a state of delusion, and that your Majesty even anticipated the fatal event which we all lament." The King had actually said to Lord Liverpool, before he left for Scotland, that he was convinced Lord Londonderry was not "right in his mind," and that he felt great alarm for the consequences of the break up of such a mind*—enough to justify a compliment to his

* Letter of Lord Fitzroy Somerset, vol. i. p. 253.

Majesty's wisdom such as, if palace walls had memories, might make those of Holyrood think that the days of James the First had come back again. But all this salaaming had an object. It might be that the King, apprehending the inevitable coming man, would put some one else in his place without waiting for Lord Liverpool's advice. But how could the King entertain any unworthy doubt of his servants when the Duke, after such a prelude, asked him to delay his decision on the subject until his return, assuring him that the Cabinet would then proceed to the consideration of the measures to be taken, "with no object in view except the transaction, *to your Majesty's satisfaction, ease, and comfort*, of the important business hitherto so ably transacted, *under your Majesty's directions*, by the late distinguished individual, and the honour of your Majesty's government; all which is humbly submitted by your Majesty's most devoted and faithful subject and servant." The King did delay his decision. The Duke was appointed Plenipotentiary to the Congress. When his Majesty returned to London, his Grace was suffering from a severe ailment, which for a fortnight confined him to his bed. Meantime, the subject of Mr. Canning's appointment had been broken to his Majesty, and he sent a *friend* to the Duke's bedside to consult him. This *friend* (the King always speaks of him in italics) "gave me" (his Majesty writes to the Duke on the following day) "a most faithful and detailed account of your opinion and kind feelings under the painful embarrassment in which we are at present placed; and I must confess that it has produced a stronger conviction on my mind than anything that had been previously urged by others. If I could get over that which is *so entirely connected with my private honour*, all might be well; but how, my friend, is that to be effected? I have a perfect reliance on your dutiful affection towards me as your Sovereign; I have the most unbounded confidence in your sentiments of regard towards me as your friend; my reliance, therefore, in you is complete." Now clearly the critical moment of this great affair had arrived; and the Duke was skilled above all things in the knowledge of opportunity. As when on some Spanish field, the fortune of the day long suspended, General Wellesley's cold blue eye, patiently watching the varying chances of the fray, was wont at last to see some laxly wavering ebb or ragged gap in the enemy's array, whereon, in an instant alert and grimly joyous, he speeds his staff to right and left, orders up his reserves, and flings the full weight of his line of battle on the foe; so now, seeing his Sovereign's mind beset and pressed by the exigency

of concurrent circumstances and the urgency of many opinions adverse to his own, until at last the royal will began to falter, the Duke marshals all his forces of persuasion, influence, and devotion, and by their sheer stress compels the King's consent. Seldom in English history have such great results depended on the Sovereign's personal inclination. Never was statesman so near to being undone by his own victory. The memorandum of the 7th September, 1822, in which his Grace's reasons for advising the appointment of Mr. Canning to the Foreign Office are given, is an excellent specimen of his public documents—lucid, methodical, exhaustive in its treatment of the subject, calm in its temper, and tact all over. But he little foresaw what a disturbance this appointment would effect in all the grand objects of policy to which his mind inclined abroad, in the relations of England with the great military monarchies of the Continent, and in the encouragement of the Revolution throughout the world; at home, in the steady strengthening of the cause of Catholic emancipation, until he himself should have to succumb unconditionally before it; nor how soon Mr. Canning, restored to public life by the Duke, would coolly dispense with the Duke in making a Ministry of his own. The following passage of the memorandum is doubtless the foundation of the anecdote related by Sir Henry Bulwer:—

I come now to consider that which is the most important point of all in the question—your Majesty's feelings—and I assure your Majesty that I do so with that interest and dutiful affection by which I am bound to your Majesty, in every manner in which a subject can so feel towards his Sovereign. Your Majesty conceives that Mr. Canning has offended you, and that your Majesty's honour requires that you should resent his offence. If I were to consider such a question as between two individuals, I might be of opinion that the public interests and the public duties of these individuals would render it necessary that their private feelings upon such a question should be laid aside, and that the offence, for the benefit of all parties, should be buried in oblivion. But in a case in which the offender is a subject, and the offence given is towards the Sovereign, I can have no doubt upon the subject. The honour of your Majesty consists in acts of mercy and grace, and I am convinced that your Majesty's honour is most safe in extending your grace and favour to Mr. Canning upon this occasion, if the arrangement in contemplation is beneficial to your Majesty's service.

There is more to the same effect, but it is all in the same obsequious tone; not a trace of the curt, uncourtly spirit of the anecdote.

Prince Metternich, it appears, "in a private and confidential correspondence with a distinguished person with whom he was

on terms of great intimacy, and to whom he wrote without reserve" (which correspondence Sir Henry Bulwer has had an opportunity of reading *), permitted himself to speak of the Duke, in his character of ambassador at Verona, as "the great baby." The Duke was not very well qualified, by the natural temper of his character and the hard habits of war, for the artful displays of diplomacy and its subtle psychological tactique. Alongside of Metternich and Pozzo di Borgo, Nesselrode and Lieven, Montmorency and Bernstorff, Châteaubriand and Caraman, with the elegance of their seigniorial manners, and their erudition in the customs of Courts and the traditions of Chanceries, with their finely-penned protocols, their brilliant jousts of phrase, the Duke must have looked a being of another and a very much harder and more real order; but that he was like "a great baby" in their hands is simply incredible; and that his relations with Prince Metternich, in particular, were by no means of that nature, his correspondence shows. The Duke was naturally sympathetic with the class of statesmen to which Metternich belonged; but of Metternich's mental powers he had a poor opinion, and in his character he had little or no trust. "In respect to the German Powers," he writes to Mr. Canning, soon after his arrival at Verona, "Prince Metternich is, as usual, looking principally to the difficulties which press upon him at the moment. He feels that if he cannot give the Emperor of Russia an appearance at least of occupation in the West of Europe, till the feelings of the Russian public shall be in some degree softened, if not forgotten, upon the Turkish and Greek questions, the Emperor will return to his capital in very bad temper with the Alliance, of which the first effects will be felt by Austria."† Again, speaking of the indifference with which some of the Allies viewed the widening divergence of England from their policy in Italy and Spain, he says, "I don't think that is now Prince Metternich's opinion; nor is it that of the Emperor of Austria, I am certain. But it is not the habit of the Prince's mind to look very far before him, and it is not impossible that he may, when pressed to a decision, adopt that line which will relieve him from the most immediate and pressing difficulty, notwithstanding that the consequence may be to separate him for a time from England." In his direct dealings with the Prince it is evident that the Duke felt that Metternich's words were by no means certain quantities. He charges him with having completely misrepresented the language of con-

* "Historical Characters," vol. ii. p. 331.

† Vol. i. p. 494.

fidential communications that had passed between them;* and, in a direct correspondence with him on the subject of the repayment of the Austrian loan of 1792, he treats his conduct rather as that of some shabby attorney trying to get his client clear of a just debt, than that of a high-minded minister, charged with the honour of a great empire. That Metternich should not retain an amiable impression of the Duke's bearing at Vienna and Verona was therefore natural; and if he had said that Lord Wellington's diplomacy had too much of the rough smack of the camp about it, he would have had an excuse; but it seems highly unlikely that he should have characterized it by the particular phrase which Sir H. Bulwer imputes to him.

In truth, the Duke of Wellington's position at Verona was one embarrassing enough to any ordinary English plenipotentiary, but full of extraordinary difficulty for him. Nowadays it is the habit of cursory readers of history to suppose that after the Emperor Napoleon was sent to St. Helena, in 1815, there was a long and, in the end, rather stagnant calm in European history, until the French Revolution of 1830 opened a new era of trouble and adventure. But it is a terrible fact and a problem to ponder upon, that the sovereigns and statesmen of that period of peace really thought they had got rid of very little of the danger which was their daily dread, in securing the person of General Bonaparte. The Revolution, of which he had been in their eyes the incarnation, was not less awful to them, now that they could no longer deal directly with its master and its slave; and that in its disembodied form it seemed to move about Europe like an evil spirit, filling the minds of men with sudden insurgent fury, or like an earthquake, threatening thrones and establishments with swift inscrutable collapse. The politico-religious movement called the Revolution was as present to the minds of Continental public men in 1818 as it is in 1868. English public men then, as now, denied its cosmopolitan character, and said that there were revolutions and revolutionary movements, but no such thing as *the* Revolution in the same sense that men speak of *the* Reformation. Mr. Canning was of this mind. The new Foreign Minister of England was no longer the vehement anti-Jacobin who had learned philosophy from the words of Burke, and policy from the acts of Pitt. He was already meditating the new foreign policy, secretly sympathetic with revolution everywhere, but openly sympathetic with it whenever it attacks

* See Memoranda of Lord Londonderry (third Marquess, then ambassador at Vienna), Nos. 2 and 3, vol. i. pp. 484-6.

Catholic states, especially if they happen to be weak states, which Lord Palmerston afterwards developed and established, and which is especially associated throughout the world with his name; a policy which, effecting for England an execrable isolation among Christian states, and burthening her with the alliance of the common enemies of all mankind, is sure to be one of the chief causes of her ultimate ruin. But the Duke was a politician of the old school. To him the Revolution was a reality, and not a superstition. He was even yet a European rather than an English personage, and retained, as it were, his Peninsular eye for Continental affairs. Of the whole period of his public life, only the last few years had been spent in England—the rest in war, or in India, or in Ireland, in circumstances which had rendered the strength of authority the first and almost the only consideration of government in his eyes. He found the Emperor Alexander the greatest of the great powers when they assembled at Verona. His influence had even increased since the peace. Austria and Prussia were only the flanks of Russia. The Czar had great views as well as great powers, and he conceived that it was his mission to stamp out the Revolution wherever it showed itself on the surface of Europe—except in the Turkish dominions, and there, instead, to give it full scope and fuel. He yearned with a feeling as fanatical in its character as Moslem ever felt, to march at the head of a Russian army right across Europe, from Moscow to Madrid, in order to crush the Revolution in Spain, recently manifested in the form of a new Liberal constitution. Mr. Canning was meantime proposing to take advantage of the troubles of the Spanish Government, and to "call a new world into existence to redress the balance of the old." A brilliant trope no doubt, as all Mr. Canning's contemporaries allowed, but it remains to be said that the effect which the independence of Chili and Peru has had on the politics of Europe is as yet imperceptible. It was the Duke's duty, however, to represent the policy of Mr. Canning, whom he had just made Foreign Minister, to the Czar and to the Czar's allies. At the same time, Spain was the country of all extern Europe which he knew best, and in which he was best known and had most influence and interest. He accepted very slowly and very unwillingly Mr. Canning's policy as to the Spanish colonies. In regard to the Czar's designs upon Spain, he had views of his own. There had been a project at one time apparently of putting him at the head of the armies of the Holy Alliance if it should be necessary to take the field again against the Revolution in arms. In 1819, four years after the battle of Waterloo had been fought, he was suddenly commissioned,

without any obvious cause, a field-marshall in the Austrian, the Prussian, and the Russian armies.† At that time a necessity for military action against the Revolution in France appears to have been apprehended. There was an idea of making Pozzo di Borgo supreme political director of Europe;* and the Duke, as Field-Marshal in the armies of all the Great Powers except France, might be the proper person for a corresponding military authority. But this project had come to nothing. Now, it was the case of France, anxious to put military pressure on Spain, in the name of the Holy Alliance, but also with dynastic motives, and with the hope of gratifying the wounded martial pride of her army. The Czar and the Duke had a conversation on this subject immediately on his Grace's arrival at Vienna. The Czar could not bear that the French should cross the Pyrenees unless with the Cossacks to look after them :—

His Imperial Majesty (the Duke writes to Mr. Canning) then said that he did not think that France could be relied upon for such an operation as that which he had in contemplation, although the protection and safety of the French Government was its particular object. His Imperial Majesty felt no confidence either in the loyalty or the military qualities of the French army of the present day ; and he considered that this operation, if undertaken at all, must be the work of the Alliance. The French troops might form a part of the army to be employed, but the great force must be one in whose military qualities and loyalty complete confidence can be reposed ; and his Imperial Majesty evidently pointed at his own troops.

To move a Russian army across Germany and France in order to substantiate a particular theory of government in Spain was an adventure in comparison with which Napoleon's march to Moscow was a sober enterprise. How Lord Londonderry might have discussed such a design had he lived to represent England at Verona, it is not easy to imagine. But it is certain that he could not have spoken upon the subject with the crushing weight of authority which the Duke brought to bear on the Czar's mind. The political and diplomatic considerations affecting such an enterprise were of a seriousness without precedent. It implied a sort of Russian hegemony of all Europe. It involved about equal risk of a French revolution, or of a French, and therefore of a general, war. The French army would never bear to be brigaded into Russian corps. The French nation, even in its exhausted state, would never endure to see the Cossacks crossing its soil in order to give the Spanish nation the knout. But supposing such diffi-

* Vol. i. pp. 20, 72, 92.

† Vol. i. p. 76.

culties altogether out of the way, and that the Cossacks had actually crossed the Pyrenees, then there was the Spanish nation to reckon with. Now, war in one country is not like war in another country. Its moral no less than its material conditions differ. In Belgium, in Northern Italy, the people are accustomed to give the combatants a clear stage, and to consider the camp the best of all possible markets. But every true Spaniard feels the presence of a foreign soldier on his soil as a personal profanation ; and so strong is this national pride, that whether the soldier is there as an ally or an enemy makes only a difference of degree. No one could know what war in Spain was as the Duke knew it. He was where he was, speaking in the name of England face to face with the Czar, precisely because he had after six years of unceasing war beaten one foreign army out of Spain with another foreign army. During all this time his difficulties with his ally had been little less than his difficulties with the enemy. His views on this subject are very lucidly stated in a memorandum which he addressed to Lord Castlereagh when foreign intervention against the Liberals was first contemplated ;* and the following passages are quoted from it.

There is no country in Europe in the affairs of which foreigners can interfere with so little advantage as in those of Spain. There is no country in which foreigners are so much disliked and even despised, and whose manners and habits are so little congenial with those of the other nations of Europe. . . .

History will show what is the consequence of a hostile interference in their affairs. I entertain no doubt that from first to last, Bonaparte sent 600,000 men into Spain ; and I know that not more than 100,000 went out of Spain in the shape of an army, and with the exception of Suchet's corps, these were without cannon or baggage or anything to enable them to act as an army.

It is true that this result of the war may be in part attributed to the operations of the allied armies in the Peninsula ; but those would form a very erroneous notion of the fact who should not attribute a fair proportion of it to the effects of the enmity of the people of Spain.

I have known of not less than 380,000 men of the French army in operation in Spain at one moment ; but their officers and the servants of the French Government had no authority excepting on the spot on which their troops stood, and their time passed and their force was exhausted by the mere effort of obtaining subsistence from the country. Such was the effect of the want of resources in the country, of the hatred of the Spaniards to the French, principally because they were foreigners and interfered forcibly

* Vol. i. p. 116.

in their affairs, and of the passive resistance of the people to the French force.

His description of his own position as Commander-in-Chief of the British army is not less impressive. "No nation," he says, "was ever under such obligation to another as Spain was to Great Britain during the late war. She was supplied with money, arms, provisions, everything to enable her to carry on the war for her independence. Her battles were fought for her, her strong places were taken from the enemy and restored to her, and everything was done to conciliate the goodwill and confidence of the people of Spain." With what result? The Duke declares he could cite "hundreds of instances" where the national pride of the Spaniards materially injured their own interests; and he refers to three several cases where his co-operation was refused, even after the Spanish army had sustained severe defeats. Finally, he says, at the end of the war, when the Spaniards had to form a new Government, it was the proceedings of the French National Assembly, and not the Parliamentary system of England, to which they referred for the model of their *Constitucion*. He evidently thought this the most signal instance of their absence of appreciation; but after all, the most Catholic of nations could hardly be expected to copy a constitution which, whatever its origin, was at that time professedly Protestant in Church and State; and the precise element which the Duke most valued in the constitution of England, the balance of power between Crown and people produced by its aristocracy, was altogether impossible on the Continent, and already sensibly losing efficacy in England.

If the Duke of Wellington had rendered no higher service to his Government than that of dissuading the Czar from the extravagant enterprise of invading Spain, his mission to Verona would have a right to be regarded as one of the greatest successes of his career. The Czar did not lightly abandon his design. After their first long conversation on the subject at Vienna, the Duke wrote to Mr. Canning that he thought his Majesty's mind was more reasonable in regard to Spanish affairs. But a month later, at Verona, the Duke found him as obstinate as ever. He had come to the conclusion that he must allow the French army to act in the first instance, but under strict terms of convention; and he proposed to send a Russian army of 150,000 men into Piedmont, so as to be in a position to attack the Revolution either in Spain, Italy, or France, as the occasion might present itself. No one, Prince Metternich least of all, seems to have had the courage to speak plainly to him as to the policy of these projects, except the

Duke. Yet Austria was the power most, and England the power least, to be affected by them. In a letter to Mr. Canning (5th Nov., 1822) there is an interesting sample of one of the conversations on the subject. The Czar begins :—

There are eight sovereigns here, with their ministers, and they all concur in the absolute necessity of putting down this evil. The sovereigns of Italy are not safe so long as it lasts, nor is France, nor Prussia, nor even I. The late Spanish minister in Russia laid out large sums of money to corrupt my soldiers and troops ; I was obliged to send him away.*

The Duke replies in his bluntest style :—

Sir, you can do nothing against the Spaniards. Let the sovereigns of Italy take care of themselves, and govern their people well, and they have nothing to fear from Spain.

CZAR. I have a report which I will show you, made by the Minister of War to the Cortes, in a secret committee, showing the state of their army. Nothing can be more miserable, or more destitute of resources than *ces gens-là*.

DUKE. Sir, if you think your cause is just, and think you have the means of attacking Spain, do so. But whatever may be the strength of the Spanish army, or the state of the Spanish resources, do not suppose that you have to deal with such a country as Naples. The country is strong, immense in extent, thinly peopled, and with but few resources, and many strongholds to be taken and kept from a people capable of defending them.

CZAR. I would attack them with the French army, and move mine and others to their support if wanted.

DUKE. If your Majesty will give me leave, I will tell you what I would do if I were the Spanish general opposed to the invading force, and I think you will be convinced that there is but little chance of military success, and none of any political result.

CZAR. Well, I will call upon you some of these mornings, and we'll go to the bottom of the subject.†

* The Spanish Government of that date appears to have pursued a precisely similar policy of corruption and disturbance to that of which the Italian Government is now so constantly guilty. It appears to have suborned the Revolution throughout Europe. The Duke will not be suspected of prejudice against Spain. Yet this is the language he felt himself obliged to use to the Spanish Minister at Vienna : "They (the Spanish Government) must refrain from endeavouring to excite revolutionary disturbances in France, and must not interfere in the affairs of other countries. I particularly asked why they should have interfered with the affairs of Naples, and for what reason have laid out their money to excite the mutiny in the Piedmontese army. These were the acts that attracted the notice of the Continental Powers to Spain." People now forget the fact that Spain ever had such a policy in contemplating the tremendous punishment which it brought upon her—in the loss of nearly all her foreign possessions, her prolonged and bloody civil war, the chronic instability of her Governments, and her utter loss of influence in European affairs.

† Vol. i. p. 491. The letter containing this interesting conversation is

This conversation is not after what Prince Metternich would call the manner of "a great baby." With the utmost possible respect, the Duke simply puts the Czar down whenever they have any conversation on the subject. No one in Europe could utter such words with such authority except the Duke. The Czar so little liked it that he stipulated, on the occasion of their last interview, that no public business should be introduced.* The Duke disregarded his injunction; but it was to speak about the slave-trade. The conquest of Spain by Cossacks had been tacitly recognized to be a chimera. "I verily believe," Mr. Canning writes on the 15th November, "that if we escape the Spanish war, it will be owing exclusively to your experience of one; and that any other negotiator than yourself would have reasoned politically and morally against it to no purpose." Mr. Canning was quite right, and no one knew this also better than Prince Metternich.

Determined to frustrate the Czar's policy in the West, the Duke was, on the other hand, of far too yielding a disposition in the affairs of the East. Though he could estimate in exact detail the difficulty of marching a Russian army to Madrid, and the danger that it would be to the peace of the world when it got there, he seems to have seen no serious difficulty in the Czar's way, should he elect to send his army to Constantinople instead. Nor did he even comprehend the extent to which the interests of Great Britain would be damaged by the extension of the Russian frontier to the Dardanelles. Nor (and this is, to say the least of it, startling) does he seem to have supposed that the Russian Government would care to possess Constantinople, if it could. Such is at least the obvious construction of the following passage from a despatch to Mr. Canning, of 18th Nov., 1822:—

I really believe the Emperor of Russia is anxious to settle this Turkish question if he can. I believe I told you that it was my opinion that if he chose it, and we did not interfere with a fleet in the Black Sea to prevent him, the Emperor had it in his power to make the conquest of Constantinople in one campaign. It is impossible that he should not see the subject in this light, and it is difficult to account for his forbearance without a knowledge of his character and habits. The Emperor would have no objection to war, but it must be on a stage on which he would have the eyes of all Europe upon him and the applause of the world. He thinks the Turks an enemy unworthy of him. He knows he would lose a great proportion of his fine army in the operation against Constantinople; that the war would be one of

very carelessly printed. What the Czar and what the Duke said is not distinguished by punctuation or otherwise. The above version is corrected accordingly.

* Vol. i. p. 618.

peculiar hardship and difficulty rather than of manœuvre and gallantry to those who should carry it on ; that many would fall victims to the climate ; and that, even supposing the conquest to be complete, the attention of the Russian Government would necessarily for many years be directed to the affairs of Asia and the Asiatic frontier rather than to those of Europe, which the Emperor prefers. I think, then, that he wishes to settle his differences with the Turks, if he can get out of them with anything like credit in the eyes of his own people.

And the same current of thought runs through all his documents on the subject. In order to divert the Czar from a course of policy calculated to revive a general war, the Duke would have yielded anything that appeared to him only to affect the interests of Turkey. Here, however, Metternich and the other governments were in complete accord with him. The British ambassador at Constantinople, Lord Strangford, alone resisted himself, and sustained the Turkish Government in its resistance ; and so well applied was the resistance, and so wary is the policy of Russia, or so ill-managed was it at the moment, that the Czar does not appear to have profited by the circumstances, which favoured the grand idea of all the Czars, to anything like the extent of his opportunity. The Duke rather resented Lord Strangford's conduct, as traversing his own policy, and even condescended to speak of it in an apologetic tone to the Czar. The transactions at Verona regarding the relations of Russia and Turkey well repay study ; but it is only possible to indicate their character here. In the Italian affairs discussed, the Duke was precluded by his instructions from taking part. But in this connection, it may be mentioned that the doctrine of non-intervention is by no means the modern novelty some suppose. The Duke, in a conversation with the Czar, attributed its origin to the failure of the parliamentary constitution set up in Sicily.

We established (he says), that which we thought the best of constitutions, viz., a government by a parliament, constituted on the principles of that in Great Britain, without its supposed abuses ; but this government failed in all the duties and purposes of government even to a greater degree than that which had preceded it ; and very soon it had been found necessary to destroy this boasted constitution as the other had been destroyed. With us, therefore, it had become a principle not to interfere in the internal concerns of any foreign country except in a case of necessity, being convinced that we could not interfere with advantage to such country, or with honour to ourselves.*

And though this was said apropos of Spain, it was meant also

* Vol. i. p. 344.

VOL. X.—NO. XX. [New Series.]

to cover the case of Italy. But the only action of the Duke in Italian affairs, it is curious to observe, was in arranging the cessation of the Austrian occupation of Piedmont, and in inducing the King to condone the treason of the Prince de Carignan, father of the present King, Victor Emmanuel.

Among the papers connected with the Duke's mission to Verona, is one which in a strange way recalls his attention to the affairs of his native country—none of which were alien to him, though in the spirit as well as in the flesh he had so long been an Irish absentee. Mr. Canning, at the instance of the Munster bishops, requests that the Duke will get the Nuncio to recommend the Pope to appoint Dr. Collins archbishop of Cashel. The Government had in the first instance been moved through Lord Bathurst in the following memorandum:—

[MEMORANDUM.]

The Roman Catholic Bishops of Munster, in Ireland, having elected unanimously the Rev. Dr. Collins to be their Metropolitan at Cashel, have sent so far back as the 25th of August their postulation to the Holy See, to obtain the usual confirmation and forms. The Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and the Earl of Liverpool have expressed their satisfaction at the choice of Dr. Collins for a station of such importance to the good order and peace of that province, and wished that some channel might be pointed out, through which their sentiments might be made known to Cardinal Consalvi, to whose department the business belongs, his Majesty having no accredited Minister at the Court of Rome: while such a channel was inquired after, Mr. Anthony Richard Blake, at present Counsel for the Lord Lieutenant in Dublin, with his knowledge and approbation, has written to the Cardinal and stated the wishes of his Majesty's Government in Ireland, that no delay might take place in expediting the usual documents.

But the Roman Catholic bishops are apprehensive that Mr. Blake's letter will be considered only as a private letter, and not invested with any sufficient character to produce effect. They therefore, knowing that Lord Bathurst has, in forming the Roman Catholic sees in Canada and the West Indies, used some channel of communication with the Roman see, solicit that his Lordship may support their act by his influence, against the act of some turbulent parish priest, who would wish to bring the appointment of Roman Catholic Bishops to the forms and confusion of a popular election, than which, they conceive, nothing would be more destructive of the peace of their respective districts.

A letter from his Lordship to Mr. Parke, Consul for the Papal States, or to the Duke of Wellington, who will have opportunities of seeing Cardinal Consalvi, or some other Minister of Rome, at the Congress, stating the satisfaction of his Majesty's Government, and wishing that no delay may intervene, would be effectual.

Mr. Canning, nothing loth to deal with a case which, if

the Veto were to become law, would be as much a branch of a minister's business as the *congé d'élire* of the Establishment actually was, took the opportunity of renewing his acquaintance with Cardinal Consalvi, and at the same time of soliciting his influence to secure the vacant see for Dr. Collins, and of entreating him to direct the foreign policy of the Holy See so as to discourage the slave trade. The Foreign Secretary's letter, written in his most airy and agreeable manner, begins as follows:—

MON CHER CARDINAL CONSALVI,

Si je n'hésite pas à m'exposer aux peines de la haute trahison en ouvrant une correspondance avec votre Eminence, non comme Secrétaire d'État de sa Majesté Britannique avec le Cardinal Secrétaire du Pape, mais comme d'ami en ami, voici au moins une preuve bien éclatante de la force de l'amitié que je ressens pour M. de Consalvi, et de la confiance qu'il a su m'inspirer. Mais je puis aussi trouver des excuses dans la nature même des communications que je veux faire au Ministre de St. Père, et dont je ne doute nullement que votre Eminence n'apprécie toute l'importance. Premièrement : Les évêques Catholiques de la province de Munster, en Irlande, ont élu à l'unanimité le Docteur Collins au siège métropolitain de Cashel ; et depuis le 25 du mois d'Août, leur postulation est adressée au St. Siège pour obtenir la confirmation formelle de cette élection. Ils ne sauraient avoir fait un choix plus agréable au Lord Lieutenant d'Irlande et au Ministre Britannique. Dans des tems aussi orageux que ceux d'à présent la confirmation d'un tel choix est d'une importance majeure pour la tranquillité du pays ; et on serait charmé si cette confirmation pouvait s'accorder tout de suite. Oserais-je prier votre Eminence de vouloir bien l'expédier avec le moins de délai possible ? Voilà, à ce que je crois, une raison suffisante pour la transgression de la loi du treize d'Elizabeth.

Mr. Canning then turns to the slave trade ; says that the only powers which now maintain it are Catholic powers ; that this causes, in the minds of many, a gross prejudice against the Catholic religion ; and asks, "Why should not the Holy Father interdict this horrible traffic, which for ages past has been the shame of Europe and of Christendom ? On whom, if not on the head of Catholic Christendom does it depend to put an end to its existence ?" Mr. Canning was evidently ignorant of the sustained and energetic efforts which the Holy See had long directed against the slave trade and against the institution of slavery. Did he not know, though he chose to ignore the fact, that its chief support at that time, and for long afterwards, was in the United States ? He concludes by urging what a benefit such an act would be to the cause, so interesting, of the Irish Catholics." "Good Protestant as you are," he writes to the Duke, enclosing this

letter, "you will not object to the bribe which I hold out to Consalvi for his assistance." The Duke, in his dry reply, says nothing of the bribe; he was not yet prepared to set off Catholic emancipation against the slave trade; but he got Cardinal Spira, the nuncio at Verona, to write to Rome to recommend Dr. Collins, and also "respecting the Pope's interference in favour of the abolition of the slave trade." And he sent Mr. Canning's letter by the same channel.

Mr. Canning, gaily seizing such an altogether handy opportunity of opening surreptitious diplomatic relations with the Court of Rome in a way that quietly compelled the Duke's complicity, did not in all probability know that his Grace had already, on at least one memorable occasion, intervened, not without effect, between Chapter and Vatican. The most constant of the Duke's Irish correspondents was the Primate of that time, Dr. Curtis, who had been for many years President of the Irish College at Salamanca. "I knew him well," says the Duke in a note on one of his letters, "during the war in Spain, in which he acted the part which an honest man ought;" and it used to be afterwards said in his see, that he was the means, moreover, of getting or giving the British Commander-in-Chief information from time to time of no small political and strategic value. The French appear to have estimated his character after their fashion. "It is notorious," he says, in one of his letters to the Duke, "and better known still by your Grace than by many others, that I was thrice banished after being imprisoned and plundered of all my property by the enemy, chiefly on account of my peculiar and known attachment to your Grace, and to the great and glorious cause you so triumphantly protected." The Duke, chary of compliments, and little susceptible of sentiment, never quite recognized the full extent of this peculiar personal attachment, which, however, was doubtless very true and real. A leading Irish ecclesiastic in Spain at that time, and in Salamanca of all places, would naturally have been an enthusiastic partisan of the great Irish general, who had beaten one marshal after another back past his college walls, and who at last, sweeping the whole Peninsula clear of the French, had barred the gates of the Pyrenees behind them. This Irish priest, nurtured by the noble hospitality of the Spanish nation, had his natural pride in claiming to be of the same country and the same county as the cold hero to whom Providence had assigned the arduous, tedious task of their deliverance. This was not the Duke's way of taking things; but no doubt he believed that Dr. Curtis believed it, and he always said he was "a very honest, loyal man," who had

"acted remarkably well throughout the war." In the year 1818, after an absence of forty years, Dr. Curtis returned to Ireland, and early in the following year he was nominated to the See of Armagh, lately vacant by the death of Doctor O'Reilly. Thereupon ensued a correspondence between their Graces, which is a valuable and interesting, if not altogether gratifying, illustration of the ecclesiastical history of Ireland at the period. The style of Doctor Curtis is itself a study. There is a Milesian exuberance and suppleness about it, restrained by the solemn pace and ceremonial homages of Castilian habit, but armed and accoutred with all the rhetorical panoply of Ciceronian Latin, according to the Latin tradition of the schools of Spain. To contrast the style of his Grace of Armagh with that of his Grace of Wellington is simply to exhibit the limits of the English language. Never was style so terse, so clear, so dry as the Duke's—so direct to the point, so wary, so uncompromising, so free from the least tendency to effusion. The first letter in the correspondence is a letter from Dr. Curtis to inform the Duke, and through the Duke, the Government, of his nomination; and to say that if Ministers had any objection to his appointment, the proper time was come to urge it on the authorities at Rome.

I find myself called upon by every sentiment of gratitude and duty to acquaint your Grace (whose goodness and humanity will, I confide, excuse this my unavoidable intrusion) that the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland have, some time back, applied to Rome, and made what is called a postulation, officially praying his Holiness to appoint me Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, in the room of the late M. R. Dr. Richard O'Reilly, which determination of theirs I but very recently discovered, with no less pain than surprise, as it had been taken, not only without my consent or knowledge, but contrary to the absolute refusal I had previously given to such proposal when made to me, and when I excused myself, alleging my advanced age, and other disqualifications, that rendered me totally unfit for such a charge. As the prelates, however (instead of acquiescing in my reasons, as I expected), have thought proper to overrule my repugnance, and to proceed in their design, I could not avoid submitting, without downright disobedience, arrogance, and contempt, amounting to a breach of duty.

Yet, as I doubted if said prelates had made, or, in existing circumstances, could venture to make their said postulation known to his Majesty's Government (which I could wish were always done on such occasions), I, unawed by agitators, who endeavoured to inflame and mislead the public opinion, take the liberty to give this notice of it to your Grace, praying you, should it appear deserving any attention, to have it communicated to such department as you may deem expedient (but keeping the whole reserved in every other respect), to the end that, if any doubts should be there entertained concerning my principles, connexions, or conduct, the nomination made in my

favour may be set aside, which might be easily effected in the present stage of the business, and without the smallest complaint on my part, as I have no desire of any such appointment, although it has been insidiously asserted by some here, who are declared and popular candidates for the vacant prelacy ; nay, and it has even appeared in our public papers that I had, in this affair, implored government patronage, and was powerfully supported by its influence at Rome, where I have never yet so much as thought of applying.

The Duke stupidly, or cleverly, overlooks the point of this letter. So far from seeing any reason for objecting to the appointment of Dr. Curtis, he takes it to be a case in which the Government should support the postulation of the bishops ; and he writes rather cordially in consequence to the Primate Elect :—

London, 8th Feb., 1819.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have this day received your letter of the 4th inst., and it makes me very happy to find that you are appreciated as you deserve in your own country ; and that it is wished to see you appointed to so exalted and important a situation as that of Archbishop of Armagh.

I consider this appointment to be so honourable and advantageous to the country that I have requested the Secretary of State, in making known to him what I thought of your character and conduct for many years that I have known you, to do everything in his power to forward the wishes of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. I don't know whether he can interfere, or, if he does, whether his interference will be of any use to you. But it can do no harm ; and it is very satisfactory to me to have an opportunity of testifying the opinion which I entertain of you.

Believe me, &c.,

WELLINGTON.

On the same day he moves Lord Sidmouth, then Secretary of the Home Department, on the subject, in guarded terms :—

This Dr. Curtis was head of the Irish College at Salamanca, in Spain. I found him to be a very honest, loyal man ; and he behaved remarkably well throughout the war. He has none of the modern notions of religion or philosophy, and although a zealous and probably a bigoted Roman Catholic, he is not inimical to the British Government, and in my opinion there is no person who it would be more desirable to see in the situation to which it is proposed to appoint him.

I don't know whether Government can or will interfere in this appointment, but, as Dr. Curtis has written to me, I have thought it proper to make known to you what he says, and what I think of him.

Lord Sidmouth was indisposed to move in the matter, and why the Duke should have referred to him is not obvious. In business involving communication with the See of Rome, not the Home but the Foreign Secretary was the natural organ of Government. All that the Home Secretary could or would

do was to refer to the Lord Lieutenant for advice. He did so, and received this reply from his Excellency :—

Since I have received the honour of your Lordship's letter of the 11th inst., with the enclosures from the Duke of Wellington, I have been employed in making inquiries respecting Dr. Curtis, the proposed Archbishop of Armagh. As your Lordship justly observes, Government cannot interfere in this appointment ; but I am happy to state that the elevation of Dr. Curtis to the Archbishopric is very satisfactory, as he is on all hands admitted to be a most excellent and loyal personage.

This letter Lord Sidmouth enclosed to the Duke, with the following rather detrimental note of his own :—

I received the enclosed this morning from Lord Talbot. There can now be no impropriety in intimating to Dr. Curtis that, on account of his character, his appointment to the Roman Catholic Archbishopric of Armagh would be viewed, not only without regret, but with satisfaction, by the Government here and in Ireland.

The Duke thereupon, in a somewhat subdued tone, wrote to Dr. Curtis :—

I have received your letter of the 13th, and I have now the pleasure of enclosing the copy of one from the Secretary of State, enclosing one from his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It will be satisfactory to you to see that your character is justly appreciated.

Meantime, however, Dr. Curtis, who inferred from the Duke's first letter that his Grace had communicated with the Foreign and not the Home Minister, had expatiated on the incidents of that contingency in the following elevated and mellifluous language :—

I must once more trespass for a moment on your Grace's goodness, sincerely to assure you that no feelings of gratitude were ever before excited in my breast similar to those produced on receiving so unexpectedly the kind and consoling letter with which, on the 8th inst., your Grace condescended to honour me, notwithstanding my humble sphere in life, and the very exalted station you occupy with so much dignity in your own and every other country capable of distinguishing unrivalled merit, and amidst the cordial plaudits of an admiring world, in which you will easily believe my poor mite is never wanting, as I can better than any others relate the examples of kindness and humanity, as well as courage and heroism, that I frequently observed to shine forth in your unparalleled person and character. So far, at least, I am sure I may venture to go, without offending your delicacy with anything in the shape of exaggeration or flattery, which your true greatness of mind must always despise.

You are pleased to say, my Lord Duke, that you meant to inform the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the proposal made to Rome by the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland for having me appointed Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, that Government might contribute its influence to

have the matter dispatched ; but your Grace seems to doubt whether Government could meddle, or whether its interference would be of any service, adding, however, that it could do no harm.

I beg leave, my Lord Duke, humbly to offer a few words on that head, which I hope your Grace will not consider as entirely useless, or too officious. I most solemnly and sincerely declare I neither do, nor ever did, wish for such nomination, which I only took the liberty of mentioning because I conceived it to be not only a proper mark of respect, but a downright duty I owed to Government, that it might preclude me, or any other it should consider as really objectionable, for a situation where it must be fairly owned, much good or evil might eventually be the consequence ; but I by no means intended to solicit the support or influence of Government ; on the contrary, I stated that I had been already falsely charged with having done so, by certain agitating candidates for that prelacy, and that in the public papers, with a view to inflame incautious minds. Yet, in justice to truth and duty, I cannot help assuring your Grace that Government can always, and most easily, preclude any such obnoxious appointments, and even recommend, with a total certainty of success, a good and well-deserving subject, whenever it finds it expedient to do so ; either by having such notice publicly or secretly given to the Roman Catholic prelates of this country, or rather, directly to the See of Rome ; as, in both places, they should be supposed enemies to religion, their own interest, and common sense, as well as disrespectful to the Crown, if they persisted in appointing suspected persons, however learned and well qualified in other respects ; and for this purpose Government has not the least necessity for a veto being enacted, which (besides being, well or ill, hitherto an unpopular measure) does not give to ministers in such appointments half the power they can employ without it, and without alarming anybody, so that it be done with prudence and unbiased equity. Angry times, and hostile sentiments, that but too long prevailed, are happily gone by, or retiring fast, never more, I hope, to return ; in spite of the agitating demagogues that still continue to perplex us with their unavailing efforts, and who will be charged to the general account as a sample of that body which they vainly endeavour to mislead.

I request your Grace will excuse and reserve those reflections, to which I had many others, and much more important, to add, but that I have already encroached too much on your precious time.

Of this letter it will be observed the Duke barely acknowledges the receipt, and takes no sort of notice of its contents. He was evidently becoming more and more disinclined to commit himself in the matter. But Dr. Curtis had formed an opinion as to his duty towards the Government and the Government's duty towards him ; and by return of post he puts his view of the case before the Duke in such a form as absolutely to compel his Grace's action. After acknowledging the Duke's "goodness and powerful interference," as manifested in the Government's approbation of his conduct

as a good and loyal subject, and its consequent acquiescence in his appointment, he goes on to say :—

I beg leave to transmit for your Grace's inspection (should you deem it worth notice, or the multiplicity of your important duties permit), an open letter addressed by me to the Cardinal employed at Rome, as Papal Minister, for the despatch of the ecclesiastical affairs of this country ; to whom I make a candid statement, among other things, of the cogent reasons that impelled me to inform his Majesty's Government of the nomination made in my favour by the Irish Prelates, lest it should perhaps be approved and carried into execution without Government's concurrence or knowledge, which I should consider as a very rash and irritating measure, besides being a breach of duty, in which I could not, in honour or conscience, take any part. I lay down this, and some other salutary maxims, that I mean to follow if appointed, that they may know them at Rome, as absolutely necessary ; and if they find them not to their mind (which I can hardly suppose, from their religious integrity and knowledge of the world), they may reject me, and nominate some other more condescending man.

Should the letter meet your Grace's approbation, I beg you may vouchsafe to transmit it to Lord Castlereagh (to whom I have the honour of being slightly known), that his Lordship may have it forwarded, if not judged improper, and delivered, sealed up, to its address.

It will appear, at least, that I do not now, nor have ever heretofore called on Rome for any appointment, but on the contrary, I prescribe the conditions on which alone I could be induced reluctantly to accept of one ; and, indeed, I understand that others who have availed themselves of powerful protectors here and abroad, are more likely than I to be promoted to Armagh, notwithstanding the nomination of the Prelates, for so things are often managed.

The tone of this letter, alas ! is a sad illustration of the ecclesiastical spirit of the times. One should not wonder at such views regarding the relation of the Holy See and secular governments had they occurred in the correspondence of a French Abbé of the previous century, but who would dream of finding them on the lips of an elect successor of S. Patrick in a country where the State had oppressed and was oppressing the Catholic religion, as was the case in Ireland ! On the receipt of this letter, however, the Duke at last took the desired action. He asked Lord Castlereagh to read and forward Dr. Curtis's letter to Rome ; and he announces the result in the following cold and constrained note :—

London, 15th March, 1819.

DEAR SIR,

Having communicated to Lord Castlereagh what had passed between Lord Sidmouth and the Lord-Lieutenant and myself respecting you, I enclose a note which I have received upon the subject from Lord Castlereagh.

Ever, dear Sir, yours, &c.,

WELLINGTON.

[ENCLOSURE.]

Cray Farm, 14th March, 1819.

Lord Castlereagh presents his compliments to the Duke of Wellington, and has the honour to inform him, that his Grace's letter, and enclosure from Dr. Curtis, have been forwarded by him to Cardinal Consalvi, and the Doctor's wishes recommended to his Eminence's favourable consideration.

The future Primate received these communications within the octave of S. Patrick, and he lost no time in producing a befitting reply. This is it:—

Dublin, 19th March, 1819.

MY EVER HONOURED LORD DUKE,

Your most obliging and kind letter of the 15th instant, enclosing Lord Castlereagh's note to your Grace, honours me beyond measure, as well by the favour itself as by the condescension in conferring it and baffles every effort of mine suitably to express my gratitude.

But so much goodness, together with the unchangeable and daily increasing regard I conceived many years back, on the most solid grounds, for your Grace's person, and my ardent wish to see your unrivalled merit and glory shine in their native splendour, without the slightest shade, compel me at length, though reluctantly, to take the liberty (which I should not otherwise have done) of acquainting your Grace with what I confide you will excuse, as the effect of cordial esteem and genuine sincerity.

When I returned to this country, in the course of last summer, after an absence of forty years, I was happy in finding most things exceedingly improved; but I observed, with extreme disgust and pain, that your name and high character were virulently attacked and aspersed by people of all classes, who, I naturally expected, would have endeavoured to exceed the just and loud eulogies given to you by all the world besides. They accused your Grace of denying and despising your country, and the county Meath in particular; of receiving with contempt their cordial address and offer of erecting to you a more magnificent statue than Ireland had ever before beheld; of voting by proxy, when absent, against Catholic Emancipation; and, in fine, of having latterly presented to the House of Lords a violent petition from hence to the same purpose.

I laboured hard to convince them (and I think not ineffectually) that such charges, if literally true, were trifling, and totally inadequate to account for the tone of asperity and dire complaint assumed by them; and that they injured their own cause very much, as well by having hitherto attempted to support it by insolent and intemperate resolutions and addresses as by the hostility of their expressions against all those that differed from them in opinion; but that the said charges were, besides, absolutely unfounded, or misunderstood, and consequently unjust and contumelious; that the vote by proxy, alluded to, had been given without your Grace's knowledge, from a blank you had left signed on quitting England—a thing customary among Peers in minor affairs (for so I had really been informed by a person that knew it well), and that your presenting the late petition proved nothing,

as members generally consider that as a duty when called upon, whether they themselves mean to support or oppose such petitions ; that your Grace's liberal sentiments and generous mind were too well known not to preclude the most distant possibility of your denying or despising your countrymen, or undervaluing their patriotic effusions in your favour ; but that as the Irish are, but too commonly, a violent, rash, inconsiderate people, who (in their public meetings particularly, and when led on by demagogues) are apt to exceed all just bounds, they should not be surprised that every wise and good man will be very cautious in declaring himself their patrons affording too easy access, or seeming to adopt their gigantic pretensions.

I strongly enforced all these and many other reflections by numerous examples of your Grace's admired conduct on the continent, but particularly in the Peninsula (of which I was better qualified to speak, as a near witness, than most others), where your unlimited discretionary command rendered you absolute master, to act as you thought fit and follow your own sentiments and feelings, but where your humanity, prudence, liberality, and condescension were, and ever will be, no less universally acknowledged and applauded than your splendid victories and military skill ; all which happened in a country torn with intestine divisions and formidable parties, of the military, religious, and political kind, whom you found means to liberate and serve indiscriminately, without offending any or exclusively adopting their measures.

These and other like reflections made a great impression on good and generous hearts, such as the Irish generally have, who immediately preconised your Grace as the greatest hero that the present or any former age ever produced ; but some few added their fears that you are about to tarnish your glory with respect to Ireland alone. For my own part, I can never entertain any such apprehension, which I consider as absurd, and could heartily wish to incline all my countrymen to agree with me in this favourite sentiment. I hope your Grace, as far as duty and honour permit, will please to pay some regard to their number, and make due allowance for weakness and prejudices.

I have the honour to remain most respectfully, my Lord Duke,
Your Grace's most obliged faithful humble servant,

P. CURTIS.

To this letter the Duke appears to have made no reply whatsoever. Personal apology was never much in his line. He pursued throughout life the simple rule of taking care of his conduct, and letting his character take care of itself. To the state of Ireland his eyes not unfrequently turned with a sense of weariness and despair. For manifestations of public opinion in that country, especially regarding himself, he had a supreme contempt. As yet he was hard as adamant towards the Catholic claims. He believed that the emancipation of the Catholics would involve the ruin, first, of the Church Establishment, and then of the Union. His theory of the

Government of Ireland was the garrison theory; and he believed that the Protestants of Ireland were kept loyal by the connexion of Church and State alone. Instead of presenting the Irish Protestant petition in a merely formal way, therefore, as Dr. Curtis had assumed, he willingly gave it all the weight of his influence. At the same time that he was in correspondence with the Primate-elect on the subject of the postulation to Rome, he writes to Lord Norbury about the Protestant petition thus:—

I see that I am to present the petition from the Protestants of Ireland to the House of Lords, which I will do with pleasure. I have been long out of the way of domestic politics, and I confess that I am not one of those to whom the new lights on the subject of the Roman Catholics have been communicated.

Apart from the Catholic claims, the whole portentous condition of the country was manifest to his mind. Coming from one whose words were always so well weighed, these in a letter to Lord Clancarty, written in 1821, are exceedingly significant:—

I agree very much in opinion with you regarding the distress in Ireland. The truth is that there is no want of provisions, but a great want of money to buy them. If a few more of the landed proprietors had done what you have this spring, and had gone over to look at their properties instead of brawling and balling in London, the distress would have been relieved. I am really alarmed, however, about the state of Ireland. A population of seven millions, increasing in an immense proportion, without employment and inhabiting a country which, without being adequately employed, produces a superabundance of everything that is wanted in this market, and this population, owing to the great number of absentee proprietors, getting in fact nothing in return for the produce of their country thus consumed in this, appears to be a dangerous phenomenon in political economy.

I believe we have not yet seen the last call of the Irish population on the charity of their English countrymen; and we shall yet have something more to do for them than give charity balls and brawl upon distress.

We want in Ireland the influence of manners as well as laws. How we are to get the former in the absence of nearly all the landed proprietors is more than I can tell.

Gradually, his mind underwent a certain change on the Catholic question. It is a mistake to suppose that he adhered obstinately to the policy of No Surrender until after O'Connell had been elected for Clare County, and that he then suddenly succumbed before the apprehension of civil war. The state of Ireland, and still more, perhaps, the difficulty of conducting the King's Government with a Cabinet divided on such a sub-

ject, had long convinced him that a permanent settlement must be devised. There is very little evidence of the progress of this change in his opinions, excepting a hint here and there, nothing definite; until at last, in the very last document of these volumes, is given "a Memorandum on the Case of the Roman Catholics in Ireland," exhibiting the whole state of his mind on the subject.

This paper, which is in reality his first serious step on the road which four years afterwards led him to propose the unconditional emancipation of the Catholics, can hardly be fairly judged apart from the correspondence relative to the intervening period, which it is expected will be published in the course of this year. Then, and not until then, will it be possible to understand the Duke's whole real relation to the Catholic cause. The pith of his policy in 1825 was: Liberate the Catholic laity if you will, but suborn their hierarchy. The hyperbolical humility and supererogatory loyalty of Dr. Curtis did not affect him. He regarded the Irish Catholics as a theocracy, and in order to make the laity free citizens he held that the link between the laity and clergy must be severed. Accordingly, he proposed to negotiate at Rome for the reduction of the Irish Catholic Church from the rank of a national to that of a missionary Church, to be governed, not by bishops with settled sees, but by removeable vicars, to be nominated and paid by the British Government. The method of nomination proposed was that the Government would designate two names, of which the Pope should select one. "Having settled these measures at Rome," he concludes, "they should be recognized by Parliament, and the same Act should repeal any law imposing any disability upon a Roman Catholic." Fortunately, the Roman Catholics of Ireland were determined not to have their civil liberties unless the Church had her liberties too. They were rash; they were wrong-headed—that is evident; for when O'Connell is prosecuted, Dr. Curtis writes to congratulate the Government; and he always speaks of Catholic agitators as the very scum of the earth. But in the end the magnificent turbulence of the agitators, while observing the limits of the law, and only wrenching back the Constitution into its original frame, prevailed over King, Lords, and Commons; and the Clare election re-vindicated, not merely the political privileges of the Catholic laity, but saved the Church of S. Patrick from the stigma of subjection to the most heretical of States.

AET. II.—THE WITNESS OF HERETICAL BODIES
TO MARIOLOGY.

Æthiopic Liturgies and Prayers, translated from MS. in the Library of the British Museum, &c. By Rev. J. M. RODWELL.

Æthiopic Prayers and Baptismal Offices, and Selections from the Degua or Hymnal of Jared. By the Rev. J. M. RODWELL.

THREE is one thing among many others for which the Anglican theory makes no provision. We mean the discovery of fresh patristic documents. The full significance of this difficulty is not simply measured by the chance that in some monastery in the East a fresh manuscript of S. Athanasius might be discovered containing a prayer to Our Lady. It might be answered that we must wait for the occurrence before we can make use of it. But the bare possibility of the event points to the fact that the whole theory is as much based upon the fluctuations of criticism as the most extreme Protestant view. Nay the Anglican is far more dependent on that foundation than the Bible Christian, for the canon is closed for ever, while the Fathers of the first four centuries are ever receiving unexpected additions. The most elementary acquaintance with their literary history is a proof of this assertion. It is not too much to say that Anglicanism, boldly and impudently illogical as it is, could not have existed before the time of Charles I. Then S. Clement and S. Ignatius were discovered. Both were completely lost during the Middle Ages. The latter was partially published in Latin in 1495; but till the Greek was discovered in the seventeenth century, the fifteen epistles were so mingled together, false and true, that it was impossible to disentangle them. It is not too much to say that the Christian world then possessed nothing undoubtedly genuine of Christian antiquity older than the year 180, which may be assigned as the date when S. Irenæus wrote, except the Pastor of Hermas, S. Polycarp's Epistle, and the Apologists.

The Magdeburg centuriators had a clear field for imagination till the time of S. Irenæus.* It was not before Baronius, with the manuscripts of the Vatican at his disposal, had, by dint of stupendous labour and long continuous thought, created

* S. Irenæus became bishop A.D. 177.

ecclesiastical history, that anything like a connected view of that period could be obtained. His own pathetic expression that he "trod the winepress alone" is sufficient to show what it cost him, and the frequency with which in the early history he was obliged to make a later Father throw light on the two first centuries is a proof that it was rather by the assumption of the identity of the Church in all ages, than by what would strictly be now called scientific proof, that he so marvellously succeeded. His success is, indeed, a proof of the truth of his assumption, but not a proof which is strictly historical. It was really a stroke of genius in him to tell the history of the Church year by year by forcing pagan history to throw light on Christian annals; but for the period to which we refer he is almost as much indebted to Roman historians as to Christian Fathers.

Before the discovery of the documents in question, there was no possibility of a scientific history of Christianity as it existed at that early time; for the absolute necessity or universality of Episcopacy at that period could not be proved from contemporary Fathers. The Apologists, addressing themselves to heathens, could not be expected to say much of Christian doctrine. S. Polycarp is but a scanty basis for the Catholic truth. As for Hermas, the mystic who calls the Church an old woman, and whose doctrine is so vague that he has with some plausibility been considered by turns an Ebionite and an Adoptionist, could not be of great use in ascertaining the creed of Rome in the second century. There were fragments in Eusebius, but if he stood alone he could not furnish a connected view of the Christian Church. The Apostolical canons, indeed, were known, yet could hardly be accounted genuine in the face of the condemnation of Pope Gelasius, while the Constitutions and the Pseudo-Dionysius could only mislead men to mistake what was really a picture of the Church of the third and perhaps the fourth centuries for a likeness of sub-apostolic times. If we go back to the first years of the sixteenth century, of the Reformation itself, materials for a knowledge of the creed of primitive times from the Fathers alone were still more scanty. In the year of grace 1500, the history of the ante-Nicene period could hardly be called chaos; it would be more true to say that it did not exist. Eusebius first appeared in 1544, Clement of Alexandria in 1550, and S. Irenæus in 1526. Of these Fathers, manuscripts of course existed; but instead of being found, like the Scriptures, in every monastic library, they were so rare as to be practically unknown. The Church went on for centuries

without a possibility of knowing her own history previous to the Council of Nicæa. It would have been impossible then to appeal to the Fathers of the first four centuries, for they did not exist in sufficient number to speak for themselves. This of itself is enough to show that our Lord never meant them to be a standard of doctrine. The Fathers alone could never have been intended to be a rule of faith. It is ludicrous to suppose that to be the rule of Christian faith which is so fluctuating and so inaccessible. It is curious to speculate what can be the feeling of a logical Anglican (if such there be) when he is watching the turns of the controversy on the genuineness of the Ignatian epistles. His trembling faith is hanging on a Greek word or a various reading. The fact is that Anglicanism is as much the child of modern criticism as Strauss's "Life of Jesus." It is a mere branch of the rationalism which substitutes the written document, Bible or Father, for the living Church. This is not a calling of names to point a sentence or an epigram. A set of respectable English clergymen in the year 1868 go to work in the teeth of every existing Church whatsoever, to reconstruct Christianity out of the Fathers of the first four centuries, and come to the conclusion that, since an event which they call the division of the East and West, all churches for the last thousand years, including their own, have been in the wrong. Such men are simply rationalists if they continue in their position. The ritualist is a latitudinarian dressed in cope or chasuble.

Things went on smoothly for a time, till, to the discomfiture of Anglicanism, Petavius proved that the Fathers themselves required an interpreter. The selfsame arguments which the Anglican brings against his fellow-Protestant's theory of the Bible and the Bible alone, recoil against himself. The cry of "the Fathers alone are the standard of the Catholic Faith" involves an absurdity the same in kind, and greater in degree, for they require even more interpretation than the Scriptures. It is singular that Bull, in his answer to the great Jesuit, in attempting to clear the ante-Nicene Fathers of unsound statements, has himself fallen into the Subordinationism which has been exploded for fifteen hundred years, as leading to the idea that the Son, though of one Nature with the Father, is His subordinate in Person. It is a perilous thing to say that the Father is "greater in authority," even though the obnoxious word be interpreted "origin."* It must be dangerous for a man to take his faith from the Fathers when Father Newman, a man as learned

* *Def. Fid. Nic. iv. 2, 1.*

as Bull, and with tenfold his genius, took the same view in one of his earlier Protestant works.* Even Mr. Liddon, though elsewhere he shows himself superior to the miserable school to which he belongs, has been forced, in his defence of Bull, to use the distressing words that the Son † “is inferior to the Father in the order of Divine subsistence.” It is too late to add that the Son “is identical with the eternal intellectual life of the Most High,” if, as a derived being, that is, as a Person, He is inferior. Anglicans are thus going back to a theology which has been expelled from the Church, because it has been found wanting, and leaves her side naked to the attacks of Arianism. To this day Bull is defended against Petavius by certain German rationalists, such as Baur.‡ In this way Bull himself is an unconscious and unwilling witness to the great lesson conveyed by Father Newman’s essay on Development, the absolute need of the living Church to interpret the Fathers. It is not our present purpose to speak of that most remarkable book. We only notice it lest any one should suppose that anything which we have to say does away with the need of a theory of development. The Catholic Church in England owes many things to Father Newman, and, amongst others, it is owing to his unrivalled patristic learning and to his genius, that a set of facts which in Germany have been used with fearful effect against Christianity, in England, on the contrary, have been acquired for the Catholic faith. A very foolish letter, to which accident gave notoriety, once called Father Newman a Germanizer. Its author could have known nothing either of Germany or of Father Newman. Of all the men of mark in England, not one owes less to Germany than he. Arnold, Stanley, Carlyle, Mansell, even Pusey, have been made by a literature, of a knowledge of which there exists not a trace in his works. He is a genuine son of Oxford, brought up on Aristotle, not on Kant. He is the product of a university, the very idea of which has disappeared from amongst us—a place, not simply of education for competitive examinations in the civil or any other service, but where men have leisure to study and to think. At the same moment that Kuhn was engaged on his “Christliche Dogmatik” at Tübingen, Newman was writing his essay on Development. In the memorable 1845—a

* He calls the subordination of the Son to the Father a truly Scriptural tenet.—Arians, chap. i. sect. 5.

† Bampton Lectures, p. 351. We should be sorry if our readers consider this blot as a fair specimen of a book which deserves a longer notice.

‡ Tübingen Theologische Quartalschrift. 1850.

year which many of us can never forget—two men so utterly different in education, in mind, and in country, were occupied on the same subject; but Kuhn's book was an answer to Baur, and bears traces of the influence of Hegel, even while it answers him. Newman had absolutely no guide but his conscience, his intellect, and his learning. He too, “trod the winepress alone;” and, considering his antecedents, it was more of a religious agony for him than for Cardinal Baronius. Petavius had preceded him in tracing out the facts, but the learned Jesuit contents himself with stating first that the language of ante-Nicene Fathers is faulty; secondly, that their mind was orthodox. He does not attempt any theory to account for the anomaly. Newman's theory of development is original; as for the facts, he has mastered them himself, and his clever handling of them bears witness to his mastery. There may be different opinions of the truth of his particular theory; and, to be perfectly candid, we are inclined to consider it incomplete; but, as to the facts, he has acquired them permanently for the Church. We may look upon it as proved beyond dispute that the early Fathers alone, without a living authority, are not sufficiently explicit to be by themselves the instructors of Christians in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. These facts Dr. Pusey has utterly ignored. Yet, after all, he must know perfectly well that the selfsame arguments which he brings to prove that the Fathers did not believe in Transubstantiation would also prove that they did not believe in the Consubstantiality of the Divine Word. In reality they prove neither.

It was necessary to premise this, lest it should be thought that the facts which call for some theory of development have lost their force on account of other facts, to which we now advert. No discovery of fresh documents could prove, for instance, that some passages of S. Justin which we now possess are orthodox in language. Passages hitherto unknown would only prove that he contradicted himself; which would not make him a better witness.* It is not inconsistent with this to say that we firmly believe that the progress of modern criticism and discovery tends to show that far more early proof can be found of the existence from the beginning of the doctrines which are exclusively Roman than has been hitherto supposed. For instance, it seems to us that the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus has filled up a gap in the history of the ante-Nicene period enormously to the

* We need hardly say that we fully believe that S. Justin's *idea* was sound.

advantage of the claim of Rome. If it had been discovered in 1845, Father Newman would have had much stronger proofs than he has adduced of ante-Nicene Theology. Above all, with that document before him, Dr. Milman ought to have seen that Rome was, not, as he thinks, flung out of the circle of Christian thought, but the centre of the theology of the Church, and Mr. Ffoulkes might perhaps have been saved a great deal of nonsense about the West taking the doctrine of the Trinity from the East.* Again, the discovery of the Nisibene hymns, published by Dr. Bickell at Leipsic, has proved that S. Ephrem believed in and taught the Immaculate Conception. We are about in this article to comment on certain newly-discovered *Aethiopic* hymns, which are, it is true, of far less importance, yet throw a considerable light on the early worship of our Lady in Abyssinia. They were first published by the Rev. J. M. Rodwell, an Anglican clergyman and a learned Orientalist. By the courtesy of the same gentleman, of whom, for his soul's sake as well as for his kindness, we heartily say "Utinam noster esset!" we are enabled to present our readers with a new hymn from the same source. We will first attempt to fix the time of its composition, and then comment on and complete an argument used by Father Dalgairns in his essay prefixed to the "Lives of the Fathers of the Desert."

In the name of the Father, and of His Son, and of the Holy Ghost, one God. And now we will write the praises of our Lady, and Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, to whom prayer and petition shall be offered, by the children of Baptism, world without end. Amen.

Thou shalt be named the Beloved One, O thou blessed among women. Thou art that second Chamber which is called the Holy of Holies, wherein were the tables of the Covenant of the ten (I) commandments, writ by the finger of God, who of old made announcement to us, by the iota, which is the first letter of the name

of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who took flesh of thee, without change, and became the Mediator of the new covenant by shedding his Holy Blood, to purify believers and to purchase a holy people.

Pray for us, O Holy.

Wherefore we all will magnify thee, O our Lady, pure Mother of God, at all times; we will pray and look up to thee, that we may find compassion with the Lover of Mankind.

The Ark that was all covered with gold, and made of incorruptible wood, shall picture to us Him who was God the Word, and being God, be-

* "Christendom's Divisions," p. 72.

came man, without change or separation, pure and incapable of corruption, equal with the Father.

Who took flesh from thee without stain to the Godhead.

Over the Sanctuary were the Cherubim painted with the painting of God the Word, who took flesh from thee, O pure One without change, that He might be the for-giver of our sins, and the blotter out of our iniquities.

Thou art that pure chest of gold in which was laid up the manna, that bread which came down from Heaven, and the Giver of life to all the world.

Thou art that candlestick of gold which didst bear the shining Lamp, all times a light to the world, Light of light, without beginning, very God of very God, who was made man of thee without change, and at His coming gave light to us who dwell in darkness and in the shadow of death, and guided our feet into the way of peace, in the mystery of His holy wisdom.

Thou art that golden censer which bore the coals of blessed fire, which He who shall forgive our sins and do away transgression took of Thee, —Who is God the Word, Who became man of thee, who ascended up to His Father, as incense from an honourable distilment.

Garden of pleasures, garden of joy, which God hath prepared for the saints ere the world was made, planted with large trees for adornment, kept by Cherubim and Seraphim, one of whom visited thee from Heaven, and said in the holy House (Betamakedasa), Blessed art thou of women, and blessed the fruit of thy womb. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of

the Highest shall overshadow thee, for that which shall be born from thee shall be a Light to all the world.

Thou art the sweet-smelling flower that sprang up from the root of Jesse.

The rod of Aaron, that budded though unplanted and unwatered, such art thou, O Mother of Christ, our very God, who came, without human father, and wrought salvation.

All the saints shall say to thee as is their due, Pray for us, O thou that art full of grace. Thou shalt be exalted above Archbishops, honoured greatly above Prophets. In thee is majesty of aspect exceeding the majesty of Cherubim and Seraphim. Thou art truly the glory of our race, and the petitioner for life to our souls. Pray for us to our Lord Jesus Christ to strengthen us in the right faith, even in the faith of Him, and to bestow compassion and mercy upon us, and to forgive us our sins in the multitude of His mercy.

The crown of our glory, and beginning of our salvation, and foundation of our purification is in the Virgin Mary, who is the Mother of God, of the Word which became Man for our salvation, when at length He who was perfect God became very man, and therefore that Virgin bare him miraculously. Who can set forth the might of that birth?

For by His own will, and in the good pleasure of His Father, the Holy Ghost came forth and saved us.

Great is the glory of thy virginity.

O Mary—perfect Virgin—thou hast found grace. The Lord is with thee. Thou art the Ladder seen by Jacob which reached from earth to Heaven, and by which the angels of

God were ascending and descending.

Thou art that wood which Moses saw in the flame of fire, when the wood was not consumed.

The Son of God descended and dwelt in thy womb, and the fire of His divinity consumed not thy body.

Thou art that field in which seed was not sown, and yet living fruit came forth from thee.

Thou art the treasure which Joseph purchased, and found therein the precious pearl, our Saviour Jesus Christ, carried in thy womb, and whom thou didst bear into the world.

Rejoice, O Mother of God, thou joy of Angels.

Rejoice, O pure one, foretold by prophets.

Rejoice, for thou hast found grace, the Lord is with thee.

Rejoice, for thou hast received the message of the Angel of Joy to the whole world ! rejoice, O Mother of the world's Creator.

Rejoice, for thou art worthily called "full of grace." Rejoice, O Mother of God. Rejoice, thou who deliverest the living, in the salvation of all who live.

Rejoice, thou who didst suckle with milk Him who nourisheth all creation. Rejoice, O Holy one, Mother to all who live. To thee do we look up. Pray for us.

O Virgin, O Holy, O Mother of the Lord. Rightly art thou called, she who hath wondrously borne the King : A mystery abode on thee for our salvation. Let us keep silence, for we cannot express it aright, on account of the dignity of the Benefactor, for the manifold marvel of the appearance of the Word of the living Father, who descended upon Mount Sinai and gave the law to

Moses, and shrouded the top of the mountain with cloud and with smoke, with darkness and with whirlwind (naphs.) ; and by the sound of the voice of trumpets, which struck those who stood by with fear.

He it was who came down unto thee, O Mountain that didst speak in humility, even the lover of men, who was made man of thee without change, a perfect body, rational, like us in soul, in which dwelt the wisdom of God, became perfect man in order that He might save man and pardon his sins, and cause him to dwell in Heaven, and return to his former abode, in the multitude of His compassion and mercy.

Ineffable is the dignity of the Virgin ! for the Lord elected her, came and dwelt in her, even He who had dwelt in light, to which darkness approacheth not, was borne in her womb nine months—even the Invisible, the Inscrutable—and she bare him, Mary a virgin still.

This is the stone which Daniel the prophet saw, that was cut out of the lofty mountain without hands—the Word which proceeded out from the Father came and was incarnate of the Virgin, with no human parent, and saved us.

Thou art the pure Branch, and the faithful vessel of the right faith of our holy Fathers, O holy Mother of God, pure Virgin who hast borne to us the Word of the Father, Jesus Christ, who came to save us.

Thou art the Mother of the Light, the honourable Mother of the Lord, who didst bear the unseen Word, and after bearing Him didst remain a virgin. Praise and benediction shall be given thee.

Where is the tongue that shall be able to utter what should be said of

thee, O Virgin Mother of the Word of the Father ! Thou hast become the throne of the King whom the Cherubim do bear. We will call thee blessed, O Blessed One, and will remember thy name to all generations, O fair Dove, Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Rejoice, Mary, mother and handmaid ! for Him who is in thy womb shall angels worship, cherubim adore, and seraphim without ceasing outspread their wings and say, This is the King of glory. He hath come to forgive the sins of the world in the greatness of His mercy.

All the Heavenly hosts exclaim, Blessed art thou ; thou art a second Heaven upon earth ; the Portal of the East ; Mary the Virgin ; a pure star and the Bride of the Father ; the Father looked down out of Heaven and beholding none like thee, sent His Only-begotten, and He became Man of thee.

All generations shall call thee blessed—thee only, O our Lady, Mother of God.

Great things and marvellous shall they speak concerning thee, O thou City of God ; for thou hast been the dwelling-place of the Word of the Father.

All the kings of the earth shall come to thy light, and the people to thy brightness, O Virgin Mary. All generations shall call thee blessed and shall worship Him who was born of thee and shall magnify Him. Thou art that very cloud which has caused the waters of the rain, a type of the Only-begotten, to appear to us. . . .

Rejoice, O thou intellectual Garden, wherein Christ the Second Adam made His abode. . . .

Rejoice, O thou pure Star, adorned

with all the beauty of Praise. He hath come and taken flesh of thee.

Rejoice, O Bush, which the fire of his Deity did not consume.

Rejoice, O Handmaid, Mother and Virgin, thou second Heaven, who didst bear in the flesh Him who rideth upon the Cherubim and Seraphim. . . .

The ark was she of one Person of the Holy Trinity. She was that Jerusalem, the city of the Prophets, and the abode of joy to all the Saints. . . .

Let us sanctify Mary as the Mother of God, because in the city of David our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was born of her. So all we, these Thy believing people, will call Mary blessed, for she was Virgin and Mother at once. Rejoice, O pure Virgin free from stain. . . . Let us celebrate the mystery which hath been revealed to us, for He who had not been incarnate became man ; He who had no beginning had a commencement ; He who had no day, had a day assigned Him ; the unknown was revealed, the invisible seen, the Son of the living God became the man Jesus Christ, whom we adore and praise. Amen.

All the hosts of spiritual angels, the flames of fire, cry aloud and speak one to the other. The Seraphim say "Holy," and the Cherubim say "Praiseworthy," and the Raphael say "Blessed" God Almighty. They open their lips, and lift up the thought of their hearts, and open the eyes of their hearts and say with one accord and one voice, "Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Sabaoth. Right full are the heavens and earth of the sanctity of His Glory."

We all glorify Thee, O Lord, with our mouth and lips, and wholly exalt Thy name that Thou mayest keep us all

the livelong day, and by night vouchsafe us light—Thou Lord, who destroyed not the world.

Show us quickly now, O Lord, Thy compassion and mercy, this day and this night.

We will make our plaint and cry to Thee evermore, that Thou have mercy and compassion upon us, even as a father hath mercy and compassion on his son.

Recompense us not after the work of our hand, and remember not our offences and wrong, for Thou hast created and formed us. And we know not the day of our death when Thou wilt call us *hence*. We come unto Thee. There is none that can save us and be our surety. We are the work of Thy hands. Destroy us not.

Deliver us, O Lord our God, from the ill of suffering and affliction and penury in heaven and in earth. Grant us, O Lord, wisdom and knowledge, that we may know and understand the Salvation of our souls.

We ask and beseech Thee, O Lord, to look on us in Thy mercy, and do Thou cover us under the shadow of Thy wings: protect us with the shield of Thy Son; fortify Thou us with Thy might, O Prince of the Angels.

Send us, O our Lord and merciful Lord of the Watcher Angels, who

slumber not, that they may save us from the might of our foe and from the contentions of the devil, who ever more assaulteth us.

Cause us to hear, O Lord, the accents of the angels and the announcements of the holy Prophets, that we may know and understand the things of heaven and earth.

Uplift our heads and drive away from us all our foes and enemies, and put to shame the evil of death, and let him swiftly flee from us, and let Thine angels come to show us Thy compassion and mercy.

Show Thyself to us and speak to us, O Lord, as Thou didst show Thyself and speak to Abraham Thy beloved. . . .

And didst cause to come down a lamb as the ransom of Thy servant Isaac—and to Moses Thy servant—sending to him the *angel*, whose name is Gabriel, who appeared to him in a flame of fire in the Bush, and spoke to him in the pillar of cloud.

And Michael, and madest him Thy people's guide in the land of Egypt, and didst deliver him from the hand of Pharaoh.

In like manner manifest Thyself to us, and speak to us secretly as in dreams of the night, that we may praise thee, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost for ever. Amen.

It is evident on the most cursory perusal, that this is a remarkable hymn in itself. It is, however, more remarkable by the locality in which it is found. Here is a hymn of glowing devotion to our Lady, and what is more remarkable, of unexceptionable orthodoxy on the subject of the Incarnation, found in the midst of the semi-barbarous and wholly Jacobite Church of Abyssinia. Its importance will be seen at once from the position of that Church towards the great Patriarchal See of Alexandria. Abyssinia was converted in the time of S. Athanasius. Its first bishop, S. Frumentius, was consecrated by his hands. Ever since then it has been held in what may be called abject

submission to Alexandria. To this very day the Abuna or Metropolitan is a Copt, sent by the Coptic Church. Its state is a proof among many that the supremacy of Rome is the condition of the freedom of individual Churches. The Patriarchal See tyrannized over Abyssinia, and to that slavery is owing its present wretched state. So absolutely dependent was the Christianity of Abyssinia on Alexandria, that, when the intercourse between the two countries was for any reason interrupted, the Abyssinian hierarchy was more than once on the point of being extinguished. So great was the selfishness of the Monophysite patriarchs of Alexandria that when, in the twelfth century, the Abyssinian emperor, and Abuna, with the Caliph of Egypt, entreated the occupant of S. Mark's chair to allow of the consecration of more than seven bishops, as a measure absolutely necessary for the existence of religion, the patriarch refused on the very plea that if they had ten bishops they might set up an independent metropolitan see.* In such a state of things the Church of Axum was an absolute copy of the condition of the Church of Alexandria. It had no life of its own, and reflected simply the dominant party in Alexandria. This being the case, the hymn throws light on many things. We have in it a specimen of the common popular teaching of the See of S. Mark. There is an obscure tradition that the addition of the latter clause of the "Hail Mary" was first used in Alexandria. If it can be made out, as we believe, that this hymn was probably composed before the Council of Chalcedon, this tradition becomes by no means to be despised. The men who could sing "All the saints shall say to thee, as is thy due, 'Pray for us, O thou that art full of grace,'" come very near to the "Hail Mary." It must thus be thrown much further back than the sixteenth century, where even Mabillon places it.

Besides, however, its positive witness to the early invocation of our Lady, the hymn also throws light on an important question. How are we to explain the presence of a remarkable devotion to the Blessed Virgin existing in Churches so heterodox as the Jacobite?

On the highlands of Armenia, where the wildest and most popular form of Eutychianism prevailed; among the more decorous and intellectual Monophysites of Antioch and Alexandria; in Abyssinia, where Christianity is so disfigured as

* Renaudot, *Hist. Patr. Alex.* p. 510. For curious and much earlier instances, which must have some foundation, *vide* "Assemanni Bibl. Or." i. 362; Neale's "Church of Alexandria," ii. 197.

to be susceptible of corruption by Judaism, we find the same devotion to Mary. There is to us something mournfully fascinating in the old Church tones lingering among the descendants of the wild Gaianites, and amid the degraded usurpers of S. Cyril's throne. It is as if the spirit of S. Gregory the Illuminator was still hovering over the fortress monasteries of Armenia, and as if S. Ephrem refused to leave his old haunts in further Syria. But putting aside our deep compassion for these ruined churches, the question has a scientific interest. It is instructive to see what becomes of the fundamental ideas of Christianity when, instead of developing, they have been arrested in their growth, turned aside, perverted, or corrupted. At this moment, however, we are only concerned with the origin of devotion to the Blessed Virgin among the Jacobites. We answer unhesitatingly that it springs from a time previous to their separation from the Church, that is, to the fourth Ecumenical Council. To establish such a conclusion, we must be content to follow patiently and carefully a long examination into the various steps of the scientific evolution of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

First, it is evident that the best way of ascertaining the date of a dogmatic document is to ascertain to what period the expressions of doctrine contained in it belong. Not only the presence of terms which did not begin to be used before a certain period, but still more, the absence of words which violently agitated the Church at a particular time is to be noticed. Thus, Professor Hefele proves that the Ignatian epistles belong to the time when the separation between Judaizing and Docetic Gnostics had begun, but was not consummated. In other words, the state of doctrine in the epistles corresponds to that of the Christian consciousness in the time of S. Ignatius.

In such an investigation a word may be of importance. In the Ignatian controversy a vast deal turned on the occurrence of the term "silence" in connection with God; and every scholar will remember how the whole question has been settled by the discovery made through the "Philosophumena,"* that the word was as old as Simon Magus. Now it is evidently possible to apply these principles to our hymn.

It is essentially a dogmatic hymn,† and in some of

* "Philosophumena," 173.

† We have used the word hymn throughout, though we are informed that there is no metre. The term, however, is applied to the Trisagion and the Gloria in Excelsis, and to the compositions of Marius Victorinus Afer.—Gallandius, viii. p. 199.

its parts reads more like a creed than a chant. It is meant to teach the people of Abyssinia the doctrine of the Incarnation, as well as devotion to our Lady; and the two are so woven together as to be inseparable. We will therefore examine one by one the various dogmatic expressions in it, till we arrive at the most modern, and thus ascertain the earliest date to which the document can be assigned. After that we will see what positive or negative evidence can be found by which we can fix the latest period at which it could have been written. We must thus enter somewhat at length into the development of that great doctrine. We have high authority for throwing it back earlier than has been supposed.

By the end of the second century Gnosticism was fairly expelled from the West. It had been a long and very dangerous struggle. Gnostic doctrines appear to us wild and fantastic because the Church has now so thoroughly taught the world her concept of God that every other looks absurd by its side. It took, however, a long time before this was effected. The appearance of Christianity, bursting suddenly on the world, had acted as a tremendous stimulus to thought, and all over the East, where it was fast penetrating into regions now but little known to us, earnest thinkers of every kind tried to arrange this new religion with their previous views and ideas. It is not wonderful if, on the sudden rush of this heavenly light, men half awake mingled the old dreams of the long night with the real world thus revealed to their gaze. The most curious part of the phenomena of Gnosticism is the exceeding variety of its doctrines, whilst their moving principle is one. Simultaneously and without collusion, Syria, and Egypt, and Persia attempt to leaven Christianity with their systems. Christianity would not be leavened by them, but if they have any truth in them must leaven it. The Church opposed them in various ways. It was a contest about the principles rather than about the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Was faith or was intellect to be the moving principle of the Christian soul? All the fine arts as well as logic were employed in defence of the heresy. The poetry of the Sibylline Books is full of insidious hexameters, calling Christ eternal God, yet insinuating Gnosticism. Valentinus and Bardesanes set Gnostic hymns to music, and precious gems are often found engraved with Basilidian emblems. In Alexandria, the great mart of thought, the vast Exchange of the intellectual world, where Europe, Asia, and Africa met to mingle and to barter ideas, the members of the Catechetical school disarmed Gnosticism by allowing the right principle of

which it was the counterfeit. Clement's perfect Christian is a Gnostic; he grasps the faith with his intellect, reconciles it with what is true in natural religion, and seeks to unite in an intellectual system the various parts of what is revealed. In the West Gnosticism was met and vanquished by other means. In Gaul S. Irenæus treated it more roughly. He unmasked its immorality and its dishonest organization of secret societies. Above all he grappled with its monstrous error, and showed its opposition to the truth. The authority of Rome was more efficacious than the intellect of Alexandria. How widely known and sorely felt by heretics was the Roman claim in the middle of the second century, as even Protestants have seen, is proved by the anxiety of the author of the Clementines to exalt S. James above S. Peter as an opponent of Marcionite Gnosticism.* The Western Church thoroughly succeeded in casting out the venom which still continued to convulse the East.

It was not, however, the principles alone of Christianity, but it was also the Christian concept of God which was attacked by Gnosticism. However widely separated are Gnostic sects in their origin, in locality, and in their views of God, they agree in one thing, in the doctrine of Emanation. Whether in the Manichean Dualism of the Ophites, or the thoroughly Gnostic Valentinian view of God as the great Thinker, of whom all other beings are thoughts, or in the half Christian, half Judaic Basilides whose God is an abstract, incommunicable Essence, Gnosticism agrees in one thing—in the view that what we should call God's attributes, and the Divine Persons in Him, are a series of beings generated out of Him, and are hypostatized emanations from Him. The theological work therefore of the last half of the second century, was the scientific establishment of the truth that in God the attributes and the Divine Hypostases are not really distinguished from His Essence. This is the *actus purus* of S. Thomas. This is the truth which is affirmed when we say that God is the Absolute; and when by a condescension of Divine love, He through His attributes, or as one of the Divine Persons, enters into relations with creatures, He still continues to be essentially the Absolute. This truth was scientifically won for the world at that early period of Christianity.

Now let us turn to the beginning of the third century. So thoroughly had the Church succeeded in making the

* Dorner, *Entwickelungsgeschichte*, note, p. 340. The author's words are: The Roman Episcopate, in which already the Christendom of the heathen world began to consolidate itself, as its central point.

minds of men realize this truth, that in its excess it produced Patrionians and Sabellians. These two forms of one heresy were much more simultaneous than it was formerly supposed. From the *Philosophumena* it appears that Sabellius was expelled from Rome about 218, whilst hitherto the time of his greatest influence has been placed about 259. There were therefore, simultaneously, within the walls of Rome, two classes of the same kind of heretics, both laying down as the basis of their teaching the view that God being absolutely One, there can be no interior relations in Him, no distinction in His inner life. Of these, the Patrionians held that the Eternal Father was incarnate and suffered on the cross. By a strange inconsistency, they attributed change to God. As long as all the Godhead changed together, they seemed to think that change did not interfere with His simplicity. The less religious but more logical Sabellians considered Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be distinctions external to the essence of God, indicating relations in which the Monas stood to other beings. These were, what the Germans would call, successive momenta of the life of God. Not, however, from Praxeas or Sabellius came the great danger to the faith during this period of restless intellectual activity. There was a third section, the party of intellect and science, strong by its popularity and by the brilliant talents and position of its leader Hippolytus, backed by Origen in Alexandria and Tertullian in Africa, claiming to be exclusively the Roman school, and already well-deserving of the cause of orthodoxy by its opposition to Noetus and Sabellius. They started from a right principle, that the Godhead was One, and yet that there were real distinctions in God. The Christian consciousness of the Church was too strong for Sabellius. From the very first, the Church had taught that God Himself was Incarnate, and that God Incarnate was not the Father but the Son. There were distinctions then in God; where were they to be found? The answer of men who, if mere natural ability and great learning constitute greatness, were without doubt the greatest Christian thinkers of the time, was as follows. There is a real distinction between Essence and Hypostasis; the one great Absolute, Incomprehensible, and Infinite Essence possesses its Logos of One Substance from all eternity, undistinguished from it, for in God there is no real distinction between Thought and Thinker; but for the sake of creating objects outside God, that same Logos, without ceasing to be God, became hypostatized, as thoughts, when silence is broken, become words. There was then, according to Hippolytus, a real distinction even in time

between the Essence of God and the Logos hypostatized at the moment of creation. Invented as was this theory for an orthodox purpose, that is, to express a real distinction in God, without impairing the Unity of Essence, it had great plausibility, easily as we now see its profound error. It required all the firmness of Popes Zephyrinus and Callistus to keep steady the wavering course of Christian thought, and to expel from the schools the erring tendency of scientific theology. In the face of an outcry that they were favouring Sabellianism, they maintained what was called the Monarchy of God. S. Callistus anticipated by eleven centuries the definition of the numerical unity of God, which, till the discovery of the *Philosophumena*, was supposed to have first authoritatively taken place at the Fourth Lateran Council.* The Father and the Son are *εν*, One Thing, the Absolute Godhead.† In other words, there is no distinction between Essence and Person. There is a real distinction between Father and Son, but each is wholly and entirely the One Absolute God.

Such was the contest which was going on in Rome in the first years of the third century, a struggle more important than all the parts of the great world-drama which was being played out—than the victory of Severus over Pescennius Niger and his triumphal procession, than German inroads, and the squabbles of Geta and Caracalla, or the oriental religion of Elagabalus, or the last fight of gladiators, or any other of the thousand events with which men's thoughts and tongues were occupied. What was defined then, forms part of our thought of God now. It is not however of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, but of its effect on that of the Incarnation, that we are going to speak.

The development of that great doctrine is commonly said to have occupied the Church in the fifth century. Christian thought, however, cannot thus be mapped out and classified. It follows a method of its own, not to be anticipated by human logic. It is an organic, living whole, and like a majestic tree grows altogether. As Christian doctrine was delivered whole to the Apostles, and from them to the Church, no one part can be developed without an effect on the others. Thus, though the Gnostic controversy was

* V. p. 145 of F. Newman's translation of S. Athanasius.

† Οὐκ ἀλλοὶ εἴναι πατέρα, ἀλλοὶ δὲ νῖον, ἐν δὲ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν. *Philosoph.* ix. 12. He also said that the Father and the Son were τὸ πνεῦμα ἀειπετόν. Both Döllinger and Hagemann, men of diametrically opposite schools, have shown with great ability the inconsistencies of Hippolytus.

principally occupied with the concept of God, yet the works of S. Irenæus contain much about the God-man. Gnostic teachers were, as a whole, Docetic, and each of them had something to say about Christ. Valentinus makes His Passion to be a type of the world-spirit; Basilides ascribes to Him the power of sinning. With all, He was but one among many Æons. S. Irenæus restores Him to His proper place, the Alpha and Omega, the one final cause of all creation, the central point on which the whole universe turns. This he could not be, unless He was Very God. It was the Patripassian movement, however, which had the greatest influence on the march of doctrine. It could not be otherwise, for that view has a most remarkable affinity with many later forms of Eutychianism, and for this reason many expressions which look as though they belonged to the fifth century are to be found in ante-Nicene Fathers.

On the other hand, the tendency of the peculiar views of the Logos held by Hippolytus was to cut off the Essence of God from all share in the Incarnation. The greatest impulse to Christian speculation, however, came from the enunciation of the truth. Clear above all the hubbub of controversy, like a trumpet giving no uncertain sound, rose the voice of the Sovereign Pontiff. It was the intelligible word of command amidst the din of battle,—“I only know of one God, Jesus Christ, and no other, who was Incarnate and suffered.” Thus, again, the fifth century was anticipated.

“ The Divine Essence” (*πνεῦμα*), St. Callistus continues, “ which was Incarnate in the Virgin, was not a different (essence) from the Father, but one and the same.” In other words, “ through His appearance in the flesh, the Son has not lost His connection with the Father, or, to use the expression of the Council of Chalcedon : though the Son has become of one substance with man, He still remains of one substance with the Father.”*

Not only did the Pope declare in equivalent terms the *όμοοντιον*, but he saw its bearing on the Incarnation. The tradition of Rome was ahead of that of other churches by several centuries. It is simply ludicrous to regard the West as behind the East in theological science. If theology were, as Dr. Milman considers it, a matter of blood, he would have to account for the fact, how the early Popes, being Greeks, lost (according to his hypothesis) the power of speculation, which he considers to belong to their race. The real difference between the East and West is, that the East had a

* Philosoph., 285-289. Hagemann, Die Römische Kirche, 122.

strange facility for raising and quarrelling about theological questions, while the West had the power of deciding, and deciding them right. A Greek on the throne of Rome acquired a supernatural power of seeing what was to be believed.

What, however, concerns us at present, is to note how perfect already is the enunciation of the Incarnation. Enough has already been said to show how clear and consistent with itself was the view of the Roman Church long before it emerged from the Catacombs. Historically speaking, it looks like a strange vaticination by which questions, which, according to ordinary laws of development, could only arise centuries afterwards, and, in point of fact, did arise then, were anticipated by the Holy See. Theologically speaking, it is infallibility. What neither Alexandrian metaphysics nor Antiochene logic could divine was taught at Rome. From the want of observing these facts, many documents respecting the Incarnation which have been declared spurious are now with great probability restored to the ante-Nicene era, and, above all, one bearing intimately on the subject before us. We allude to the fragments of Hippolytus against Beron, preserved by Anastasius, and rejected by so great an authority as Father Newman. We should not venture to oppose him if we were not supported by the authority of a great German critic. So advanced, or, to use technical language, developed, seems to be the doctrine of Hippolytus that many have supposed that it could not have been written before the Monothelite controversy. We can only echo the words of Dorner:—

“At this point, therefore (of the Noetic heresy), it first became clear that even now it was necessary to oppose the ἄτρεπτον, ἀναλλιώτον, ἀσύγχυτον of the two natures, although not in these precise terms, to those who aimed at bringing the Father and Humanity to perfect unity without distinction in Christ. At a higher stage the very question which now occupied the Church in relation to the Father, was raised again in relation to the Logos. But this position of the matter being properly understood, the chief objection against the genuineness of Hippolytus’s work against Beron must have fallen to the ground of itself.”*

We may take, then, the doctrine of Hippolytus as a proof of the style of the teaching of a cultivated Christian priest of the third century on the Incarnation. There is this peculiarity about that remarkable man, that, except in the expression of his

* Dorner, *Entwickelungsg.*, i. p. 535.

own subordinationist views, his language is pious. He is full of feeling about the divine condescension, about the Passion, and about Our Lady. The scientific Hippolytus is very different from the preacher on the Theophania. It may be that his devotion to Mary won for him his final submission to the Holy See, of which we have a tradition in Prudentius.

There are many expressions, then, which look as if Hippolytus had realized the whole doctrine of S. Leo's letter to Flavian. The Logos in the Incarnation is perfect God and perfect Man. Each nature, however, remains, and preserves its own manner of working; and these natures are without change and without confusion. Here, then, we have two natures and two operations, and so far the fragment might have been written by S. Leo, or even by some Pope after the controversy on the "energies" had begun. Yet on a closer inspection, Hippolytus falls short of S. Leo's doctrine. In the grand letter to Flavian, each nature works in common with the other; each is active.* Room is left for the freedom, though not the independence, of the human element. In Hippolytus its co-operation with the divine is expressly denied. It is put on as a garment, and used as an instrument. With him the human nature has not only no person of its own, which is true, but he nowhere expresses, what is also true, that the Divine Logos acted as a Person to it. Everywhere in him God does human things through the humanity, a perfectly true statement, yet incomplete, unless it is expressed that the point of union between the two natures is the Personality of the Word imparted to the human nature. Otherwise no room is left for human freedom, for a perfectly selfless humanity could only have the instinctive freedom of an animal. Since it had no Ego of its own, it must have a divine Ego, for personality of some kind is a necessary condition to human liberty. But there is no proof that Hippolytus realized the fact that the divine hypostasis acted as the personality of the human nature. The full moral idea of personality is so thoroughly Christian, so new to the Pagan world, that though it existed from the first in the Apostolic teaching, all the judgments

* Compare S. Leo—*Agit utraque forma, cum ulterius communione quod proprium est; verboscilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est* (Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, ii. 340)—with Hippolytus: *Θεότητι μὲν τὰ θεῖα διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ παναγίας σαρκός, οὐκ ὅντα φύσει τῆς σαρκὸς ἴντρυων· διθρωπότητι δὲ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα, οὐκ ὅντα φύσει θεότητος, ἀνοχῇ πάσχων θεότητος.* (Gallandius, ii. 469.) Hippolytus saw very properly that identity of operation would imply identity of natures, but did not see further that co-operation, which he classes with identity, did not involve the same inconvenience. (Fragment V., p. 468.) His was a defective rather than a wrong view.

which it implies were not present to many Christian minds till long afterwards. To say that no Christian doctor had these judgments before him at that early time, would be to assert what cannot be proved. To deny that S. Callistus would have expressed them, if the question had been put to him, would be untrue. Yet nothing shows that Hippolytus was conscious of them. He says that the divine and human coalesced into one hypostasis, which is by no means saying that the divine Word was from the first the Person of the human nature. His notion of hypostasis was much more the conception of a thing which terminated and completed the human nature, a true concept which is often found in the later schoolmen, but which is rather the metaphysical view of a subsistence than the whole moral notion of an Ego. The human, according to him, is held together and mastered rather than governed as a moral being by the Word. At this stage, then, of the doctrine, he may be said to have arrived. He had a clear view of the existence of two natures. He also saw that there was an intimate link between them, so that the divine could act through the human. Thus far his sight was clear, and his view was developed. But he did not see what was the link between the heavenly and the earthly nature. For this reason the grand glories of the sacred Humanity were hidden from him. He only knows it to be the channel of suffering to the Word, the means by which the Lord of glory was humbled, the bound (*πτωσις*), the self-contraction of the Infinite. With this exception, however, the whole doctrine of Hippolytus on the Incarnation is most remarkable.

Before we proceed, however, we must notice another remarkable fragment, pronounced to be genuine by Dorner, and used by Father Harper in his answer to Dr. Pusey.

It bears the more directly upon our subject because it helps us to the origin of the use of the simile of the ark in the tabernacle, which is used in the hymn which we are considering. The figure is a very frequent one in early hymnology. It occurs in the Coptic hymn quoted by Father Passaglia.* It is common also in homilies on our Lady, as for instance in that attributed to S. Methodius.† We find it again referred to the doctrine of the Incarnation in a fragment of S. Irenaeus.‡ That of Hippolytus is as follows.§ “The ark of incorruptible woods was the Redeemer. For His incorruptible tabernacle, which generated no rottenness

* De Imm. Virg. Conc. i. 388. In a passage more like that of S. Hippolytus she is compared to the ark of Noe, p. 410.

† Gallandius, iii. 809. ‡ S. Irenaeus, Fragment 8. § Gallandius, ii. 496.

of sin, was thus signified. The Lord was sinless, was of the woods which knew no corruption as to His humanity; that is, He was inwardly out of the Virgin and the Holy Spirit, and outwardly out of the Logos of God, covered as with the purest gold." In this remarkable passage it will be observed that our Lady is the wood out of which our Lord's Sacred Humanity was made. She is one of the factors out of which His Manhood was created, and from the sinlessness of which His sinlessness is derived. Nor can it be said that the incorruption of this wood alludes to our Lady's Virginity. In the mind of Hippolytus it refers as much to her sinless soul as to her corporal integrity; for it was his opinion, in common with many others of his time, that souls were derived from each other, so that not only the body but the soul of Jesus came from Mary.* Furthermore, according to this view, the taint of original sin was derived from soul to soul, so that, if she had been stained, so also would He have been tainted, or at least that taint would have been due to Him. Above all, the same word (*ἀσητρος*) is used of her sinlessness and of His, and as in Him it is explained to be that which by its nature generated no corruption, so it must be interpreted in her. It is not only incorruption, but incorruptibility. The nature of the wood is to be incorrupt. That which is most striking here, is the unquestioning and bold parallel between her sinlessness and His. As His sinlessness included the Immaculate Conception, so must hers. As in His case undoubtedly to be incorruptible meant to be Immaculate, so it must be in the case of Mary. How widespread was the parallel on which this argument is founded we shall see presently.

Such was the doctrine of the greatest Roman writer of the third century. His expressions may be taken as a sort of tide-mark to measure the advance of Christian thought. It must be remembered that his errors, grave as they were, were principally scientific—that is, they resulted from a desire to account for the truth and to reconcile its component parts, not from a wish to propagate error. His idea was often, we fear by no means always, right, when his judgments were wrong. Hence wherever his errors were not interested, we may fairly take him as a specimen of the thinking Christian of his time.

The same kind of language is to be found, though not so far advanced, throughout the century. For instance, in a fragment of S. Melito, published by Routh, the Saint speaks of the perfection of the two natures (*οὐσίαι*) of our Lord and of the truth of the human nature, body and soul. The more we study

* Gallandius, ii. 469.

the subject, the more we shall be convinced of the very early development of the dogma of the Incarnation. The application to our hymn is obvious. Thus far we may already go. Many expressions in it which might seem at first to be subsequent to the Eutychian controversy may evidently be referred to an earlier period. There are few terms which might not be found in Hippolytus. The state of the doctrine in the Abyssinian document is, for the most part, not more advanced than the Roman writer of the third century. In both it is said that the Word became man without change or separation, pure and incapable of corruption—a perfect man, with a perfect body and a rational soul. Even the explicit mention of the rationality of the human soul of our Lord, which is rare in the early Fathers, is to be found in Hippolytus.* That writer even goes beyond the hymn in one point. He uses the term "without confusion," which is generally thought to be a product of Eutychian times. In other respects the doctrine seems to be identical. Nevertheless, there is an expression which forbids our assigning the hymn to a period earlier than the Apollinarian heresy. A further examination of the course of the development of the dogma will enable us to see this.

It is quite certain that from the beginning the theologians of the Christian Church taught the doctrine that Christ was wholly man, body and soul. This resulted from the principle which runs through their theology that the Eternal Word took upon Himself all in man which needed healing. In order to His being the second Adam, the whole of humanity must necessarily be assumed. The expression that He gave His body for our body, His soul for our soul, occurs in fathers so distant in time and place that it evidently was a common phrase forming part of the Church's popular teaching. S. Clement of Rome, S. Irenaeus, and Tertullian all use it. It must have been a kind of Christian proverb. If you had asked any Christian throughout the world, "Had Jesus a human soul?" he would undoubtedly have answered, Yes. It was a conscious part of the universal idea of Christ before the minds of all Christians. This, however, is a very different thing from saying that Christians, even theologians, had before them all the judgments involved in that idea. It required scientific psychology to announce that Jesus had each individual faculty of the soul. That He had them all, the meanest

* Cont. Noet. Gall. ii. 463. It is also found in the *Contr. Beron.*, p. 467. Indeed a great part of the objections urged against the latter work are applicable to the former, which is not doubted to have been written by Hippolytus. *Ἄσυγχρωτος* is found in a fragment (Gall. ii. 488).

Christian knew: it does not follow that they could enumerate them. To do that, it would be necessary to possess a power of scientifically dividing the faculties of the mind. One premiss of the conclusion at least must depend on natural science. Within certain limits, it might even vary from age to age. An Aristotelian would give our Lord an active intellect and a discursive power; a German would say He possessed Vernunft, a faculty for ideas, and Verstand, a faculty for judgments. This variation, however, would only exist to a certain extent; it would be unlawful for the Peripatetic to assert that the mind of the infant Jesus was a *tabula rasa*. All this implies a possibility of development.* Accordingly we find that the language of the early Fathers on the subject of the Incarnation has in this respect very little precision. The usual expression for the Sacred Humanity is the flesh of Jesus. The distinction between the soul as animating and the soul as thinking principle is entirely absent. We have seen, indeed, that the soul of our Lord is called rational by S. Hippolytus, but the distinction between the two is not stated. In like manner, Origen calls the soul of man intellectual, and thus by implication would apply the same to our Lord's soul, but without distinguishing its life-giving power. To such an extent does the ambiguity prevail, that many modern writers have plausibly asserted that the early Fathers were implicit Apollinarians. That S. Irenaeus, for instance, attributed reason to our Lord is quite certain, and has been proved even by German Protestants; † yet it is only by implication, not by his own direct assertion, that we know the fact. It is most remarkable and important as bearing on the whole question of development, that in the writings of S. Athanasius, down to the appearance of Apollinaris, there is hardly any direct mention of the soul of Christ at all. To argue that S. Athanasius before that time did not consciously and explicitly teach that our blessed Lord had a human reason would be simply absurd. His ready and instantaneous answer to the Apollinarians, and his undoubting argument that their view was against Christian antiquity, ought to render such an assertion impossible. His silence must be accounted for in other ways. It would seem as if there was a marvellous simplicity about the intellect of the Christians of early times which made them fix their minds exclusively on the subject which occupies them at the moment,

* There is a passage of Justin Martyr dividing our Lord into body, *λόγος*, and soul. It is, however, too obscure to be alleged on either side.

† Duncker, *Des H. Irenäus Christologie*, p. 211.

so that they are incapable of being diverted to anything else. This is also, if we may venture to say so, apparent in the inspired writers of Holy Writ. The minds of the Fathers were less restless than ours. The images in their intellects were, as mystics would say, fewer and more universal. There was a more angelic unity in their conceptions. From this it follows how little we can argue from their silence,* that they did not teach explicitly a particular doctrine in their ordinary instructions. We do not think that any one ought to argue that S. Athanasius did not teach his people to invoke our Lady, because he does not mention it in a treatise on another subject. Such an argument would prove that he did not know that our Lord had reasoning powers, till Apollinaris arose. What can be inferred is simply that the theory of the human intellect of Jesus had not yet passed into scientific theology as represented by his writings. The course of development in this sense is very beautiful. First comes the simple idea, pregnant with all subsequent distinctions. Then are evolved the various judgments which it contained. Then the whole returns to unity again. There is a regular thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. Thus in contemplating the beautiful idea of the soul of Jesus, the Church lays it down as a whole; then in orderly progress come forth its separate faculties; and the last decision of the Church, in the nineteenth century, reverts to the simplicity of the first, and declares that the distinction between the animating and reasoning principle in the human soul is not absolute, and that in point of fact they are one.† In one sense the second century was more right than the fourth. The marvellous circle closes at last, and the Alpha and the Omega are the same.

From all this it follows that, in the case of scientific documents, it is possible to ascertain their date by following the evolution of Christian dialectics. Tried by this standard, we may safely pronounce that our *Æthiopic* hymn is subsequent to Apollinarian times. This is plain from the stanza which calls our Lord the lover of men, who was made man of

* The case of course is different where the Council of Antioch, for instance, speaks explicitly against the *όμοοντιος*, or Hippolytus denies the personal eternity of the Son. This requires to be considered more at length than is possible in this article; and we may say, by the way, that a man must have a strange notion of dogma, who meets the difficulty like Mr. Liddon, by referring one of Origen's worst expressions to the different aspects in which different periods view the same truth. The same writer euphemistically calls, e.g. Tertullian's view, that the Son is a portion of the substance of the Father, "unsatisfactory." (*Vide* Bampton Lectures, 630, 634.)

† *Vide* Council of Vienne and Letter of Pius IX. on Günther.

Mary, without change, a perfect body, rational, like us in soul. Not only is this to be inferred from the distinction between the reason and the soul, the *νοῦς* and the *ψυχή*, but the expression "like us in soul" is evidently a variation of the common formula "as we are," used against Apollinaris.* The argument is a very old one; for as soon as Apollinarian and Eutychian forgeries made the minds of men alive to what we now call development, Catholic doctors perceived the value of the absence and presence of these very expressions. In arguing against a letter ascribed to Pope Julius, but forged by Apollinarists, Leontius of Byzantium has the following passage:— "In the same letter the author, when he mentions the body, nowhere says of it that it is endowed with a mind or animated; for the Fathers of that time, wherever they make mention of the body, had the custom of adding intellectual *νοερόν* and animated *ἴμψυχον*."[†] Most safely, then, may we close this part of our argument by concluding that the hymn could not be earlier than the rise of the Apollinarists.

We are not, however, yet entitled to finish our investigation, and to assign the hymn to a period so early as the fourth century. There is still an expression which plainly belongs to a later date. We mean the remarkable epithet applied to our Lady, "Ark of One Person of the Holy Trinity." Fortunately this need not detain us long, as we are enabled to point out the time when expressions of that class began to be used. They are not to be confounded, as Petavius has pointed out,‡ with the far more recent Eutychian war-cry, "One of the Holy Trinity was crucified." We find a phrase precisely similar to that used in the Abyssinian hymn, in a far different portion of the Church. Shortly after the Council of Ephesus, in the year 438, S. Proclus, the Archbishop of Constantinople, addressed to the Armenians a letter in which he inserts a confession of his faith, that "God the Word, One of the Trinity, was Incarnate."[§] There is no doubt that phrases of this nature belong to that period, and that our hymn is at least as late as the great Council which proclaimed Mary to be the Mother of God.

We have now reached the most recent stratum of Christian thought to be found in the document before us. There is not a vestige of any of the controversies respecting the Incarnation which raged subsequently on the subject of the two natures of our Lord. This is quite a sufficient proof that the interval between the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon

* *Vide* Newman's note to p. 241, Trans. of S. Athanasius.

† Gallandius, xii. 651. ‡ De Inc., v., 2. § Gallandius, ix. 688.

is the date to which we must assign our hymn. Considering the state of parties at Alexandria, the very centre of one great movement in that fierce battle, it is impossible that an Abyssinian dogmatic hymn should not have borne the impress of the struggle, if it had begun, previous to its composition. Let any one read a very similar liturgical composition, the great Canon to be found in the works of Andrew of Crete; he will at once see the difference.* The following words are an instance in point:—"Thou hast wept, O Lord, over Lazarus, to show the reality of the flesh of Thine Incarnation, and that, being by nature God, Thou hast become by nature Man as we are." Here we have unmistakable traces of controversy with Monophysites. To make the argument a demonstration, we will give the reader a specimen of another hymn subsequent to the Council of Chalcedon, of which, unfortunately, we only possess one stanza. "In the year 481," says a traveller in the Highlands of *Æthiopia*, "the celebrated Council of Chalcedon lighted up the torch of misunderstanding regarding the two natures of Christ—the Abyssinians, deeming the Council a meeting of fools, concurred in the opinion of the Alexandrian patriarch. The faith of the Monophysite was declared to be the one only true and orthodox, and the banished Dioscorus received all the honours of a martyr."

The kings of the earth divided the unity of God and man.
Sing praises to the martyr, who laughed their religion to scorn;
He was treated with indignity; they plucked out his flowing beard,
Yea, and tore the teeth from his venerable face;
But in Heaven a halo of honour shall encircle Dioscorus.†

This negative argument, from the absence of allusion to the Monophysite theology, appears to us quite peremptory. The hymn is plainly older than the Council of Chalcedon. There, however, still remains a question whether the hymn might not have been interpolated, and the part about the Blessed Virgin inserted at a later period. We are now, therefore, about to show that there are strong and positive reasons which prove that the hymn could not have been interpolated by any writer later than the division between the Eutychians and Monophysites in the first years of the sixth century.

That it could not have been written by a Eutychian during the earliest form of that heresy is evident. Ascetic, puzzle-headed, and yet holding on to his heresy to the death, Eutyches

* *Vide* the edition of Combefis, p. 302.

† Major Harris's "Highlands of *Æthiopia*," iii. 86.

was very like a class of heretics who arose on the banks of a classical stream much nearer to us than the celebrated city on the borders of the Bosphorus. He had the face to reply in the affirmative when he was asked by the Council of Constantinople if our Lord was perfect God and perfect man. Yet, dishonest as he was, there was a limit to his untruthfulness, and neither he nor his immediate disciples could have written a hymn which asserted the perfection of the body of Christ. At the Council of Chalcedon it was affirmed that he held the body of our Lord not to be human.* But there came after Eutyches a far more dangerous set of men, who were not unwilling to anathematize the poor, hesitating monk who had served as a cat's-paw to deeper theologians. Never was there a more subtle heresy than the Monophysite. How small seems the difference between "out of two natures" and "in two natures!" How fine the distinctions between the different senses of the word "nature," borrowed from Greek philosophy, and forming the subject of dispute between S. Eulogius and Severus! Yet beneath these apparently fine-drawn distinctions there lay no less than an attempt to pervert the Christian idea of God. If the essence of God and the essence of man can be so blended together that the result is one compound nature, who does not see that God ceases to be the absolute, unchangeable being which He is, and that a real Pantheism must ensue? And at last it came to that.

First came a whole century during which the leaders of the Monophysites tried in every possible way to hold their heresy, and yet to depart as little as possible from the formulas of the Church. All repudiated the luckless Eutyches, whose theory of physical composition destroyed both God and man, and formed a chemical compound of both. All allowed that, for the sake of redemption, Christ must be really God and really man. The blood must be real blood, and yet the blood of God. The formula "perfect man and perfect God" was too ancient, and the corresponding idea too much present to Christian consciousness, to allow of their denial with impunity. For a whole century after the Council of Chalcedon human ingenuity was taxed to the uttermost to enable the Monophysites to speak like the Church and to think as they pleased. The peculiarity of their position is that two opposite schools were fused into the party. The decrees of Chalcedon were apparently a triumph for Antioch. Under a grand impulse of divine grace, hereditary enemies, Antioch and Alexandria, submitted to the teaching of Rome. A very few years after we

* Petavius de Inc., tom. v. 220.

find Antioch, the ancient stronghold of Nestorianism, united with Alexandria against the truth. The fact is that the two schools held in common the principle that given an individual human nature, there must of necessity be a human personality. There is a perfect nature, argued the Nestorians; therefore also a human person. There is no human person, was the cry of the Monophysites; therefore there can be no human nature. Thus the enemies had a common basis on which they could combine. During that eventful period up to the end of the eighth century there were two strongly marked sections in the host of the opponents of the Church—one popular and tumultuous, making its way by hymns and formulas intelligible to the passions of the mob; the other representing the rationalistic logic of Antioch, cool, steady, and theological. Julian of Halicarnassus was a specimen of the first, Severus of the last. The partizans of the former came nearer to the old Eutychians, and are often called by that name. Yet not even they durst use the extreme expressions of Eutyches. They fall back upon the undoubted truth that the Godhead was no stranger to the Incarnation, which was the unutterably loving work of the Incomprehensible and Absolute God; and they used ambiguous expressions which might pervert that truth, to denote the entrance of suffering into the Divine Nature. Processions went through the streets of Antioch singing hymns in which were introduced the words that one of the Holy Trinity was crucified; a formula true in one sense, false in another. Devotion to the Holy Eucharist and to Mary was pressed into the service, and the mob of the great cities was worked up to passionate violence, by being told that the Romans, as the Catholics were called, denied that Mary was the Mother of God. Above all, they shifted the battle from the openly Eutychian ground of the essence of the two natures to their qualities. It would have been dangerous to deny the reality of the manhood; it was safe to argue that its qualities were essentially changed without its being destroyed. They took advantage of all those grand privileges which were given to the Sacred Humanity to argue that the Godhead had so flowed into it as to alter it substantially.

They puzzled the Catholics by insisting on rapid answers to abrupt questions, and reproached them with undevout subtlety when they were forced to draw distinctions. Where, indeed, the wondrous and blessed union is so close that the human nature is penetrated by the Godhead, as red-hot iron is saturated with fire, it was hard to express in words the distinction between things so closely united. It required all the steadiness of Catholics to hold on to S. Leo's formula of two natures. The

Eutychians turned the mob on their side by asking the defenders of the truth, if they meant to say that the Body of Jesus was corruptible. From its being incorrupt in point of fact, they argued that the union had deprived it of its natural laws; and they extended incorruptibility to the loss of all natural properties. All the miraculous actions of our Lord, which showed that the laws of human nature were suspended for a time by His divine power, such as His walking on the sea, became in their hands proofs that His body was not subject to those laws at all. As a consequence of the same strange perversion, they held that the suffering on the Cross was a temporary dispensation by which for a time and by a special miracle His otherwise impassible body was subject to the pains of ordinary humanity. This was the nearest approach made by them to a conception of the reality of the sufferings of Jesus. Generally they introduced suffering into the Divine Nature, and by so doing reduced the Passion to an outward show. They held the body of Christ to be as impassible from His nativity as we hold it to have been after His resurrection. Such was one of the great parties into which the heresy split. What concerns us most is the opinion from which they derived one of their names. They were called Incorrupticola, from their assertion of the Incorruptibility of our Lord's Body. Far more dangerous, however, were the Monophysites, properly so called.

Aristotelian metaphysics were used with all the suppleness and determination of heretics. It looked so plausible to say that Jesus was one Person, with a composite or double nature. As the Julianists attacked the qualities, so Severus made use of the operations of the nature to suit his purposes. There again they perverted truths. The acts of the Man-God do not cease to be human, yet what a difference between His and ours! Each nature has its operations, yet each works many of its actions in communion with the other. The human acts receive an increase of glory and of power from the Divine Nature. The very expression which was invented by the Monophysites, theandric energy, has been kept in theology, to express such actions as the raising of the dead, in which both natures take part. Moreover, all human actions require the permission of the heavenly Person. S. Sophronius calls the Godhead the leader (*πρύτανις*) of the human nature, to express the fact that the governing power* always comes from the Person of the Eternal Word. Yet the difference between S. Leo and the Monophysites is by no means one of

* Τὸ θεομονικὸν. Petavius, *De Inc.* viii. c. 12.

words. The operations are never so blended and united as to form one. The human nature does not lose its freedom, though it loses its independence. Each nature is a separate principle of action, though they act together. With the wonderful vaticination of Rome, S. Leo had asserted truths which were beforehand the condemnation of the unborn heresy. And Severus felt it; for he anathematizes "Leo and the council, who laid down two natures and two operations after the ineffable union, for they divided the one Christ into two Persons, since no impersonal nature ever has an operation." His friend Xenaias anticipated the Monothelite heresy. Severus was the great theologian of the party and a man of undoubted ability. His carefully worded works were translated into Syriac, and spread his views far and wide to Antioch and to Edessa, S. Ephrem's home.* On the basis of his theology a solemn compact was entered into by Alexandria and Antioch. Athanasius of Antioch with five Bishops sailed to Egypt, and was met in solemn procession by Anastasius of Alexandria with hymns and songs.† In a monastery on the eastern bank of the Red Sea, the two churches agreed on a Monophysite symbol, supposed to be a via media between the hated Rome and unrespectable Eutyches. From that time each new patriarch of either See sent a letter called "The Faith of the Fathers" to his brother on his elevation. But it is perfectly useless to multiply formulas and to expect the thoughts really contained in them never to emerge. They had committed themselves to the assertion of one nature, and they must bear the penalty; so dangerous is it to preserve a formula, expelled from the Roman schools. That it was not a matter of words was soon proved by the continual reappearance of the two tendencies which they hoped to have put down. The Pantheism which they dreaded broke through the thin cobweb of "one composite nature." As early as 488 a Monophysite monk of Edessa wrote on the wall of his cell, "Every nature is consubstantial with the Godhead."‡ It is remarkable that he forged a book in favour of his views, and affixed to it the name of Hierotheus, thus connecting it with the Pseudo-Dionysius. A false spiritual life, based on a perversion of the doctrine of S. Dionysius, overspread the monasteries of the East. Jacobite commentaries on the Areopagite formed the spiritual reading of the convents of the old Saints of the desert; and it is on

* Assemani, ii. 46.

† Renaudot, *Hist. Patr. Al.*, 152.

‡ Assemani, ii. 32, 290, 118.

record that an Archimandrite of Scetis brought several copies of this Monophysite spirituality from Bagdad. The heresy had spread fearfully amongst the monks and nuns of Egypt, and one of their authors boasts of 600 convents of both sexes without counting the hermits.* So fanatical were the nuns that in one monastery they are said to have killed Barsumas, an extreme Eutychian and partizan of incorruptibility, with the great keys of the convent.

Amongst all this vast population in the wilderness, Pantheistic Mysticism reigned supreme. On the other hand, most remarkably, the opposite Nestorian tendency was continually coming out among the Monophysites. For instance, the Agnoetæ, who held the ignorance of our Lord's human nature, are Severians, though we should have expected them to be Nestorians. Again, some Monophysites are said to have rejected the *θεοτοκος*,† notwithstanding their professed devotion to our Lady. By the tenth century, so thoroughly had the Nestorian element come out, that Theodorus the Jacobite patriarch, in a Synodical letter to his Coptic brother, says that Christ was originally two persons. "He was born of Mary in the body, perfect God and perfect man, whom we acknowledge to have one person out of two persons, one nature out of two natures."‡ Nor was this an accidental error; it was repeated in a solemn dispute before Nicephorus Phocas, Emperor of Constantinople, and later by Athanasius of Antioch, in a Synodical letter to Philotheus the Coptic Patriarch, and that on the very ground that nature and person were identical.§ Such is the strange history of heresy: it has but to be let alone, and it is quite certain to betray the elements which are in it, and, instead of developing, to corrupt and decompose itself. What, however, concerns us now is the fact that at an early period the old heresy of Eutyches split up into two distinct bodies, who hated each other with an intensity which was only equalled by their hatred of Catholics.

No disciple of Severus would have asserted the incorruptibility of our Lord's human nature. The expression may be orthodox, and we have seen it used quite innocently by S. Hippolytus. A Monophysite, however, would never have used a word without qualification which was the very shibboleth of their adversaries. Most anxious were the Monophysites to repudiate the Julianists. Severus wrote especially against

* Renaudot, *Hist. Patr. Al.*, p. 144; also 132.

† V. Facundus, quoted by Petavius. *De Inc.*, i. 14.

‡ Assemani, ii. 125. § Assemani, ii. 137.

the Incorrupticolae.* His friend Xenias wrote against them under the name of Phantasiasts.† As late as the tenth century, we find a Monophysite patriarch still protests against Julian of Halicarnassus; and in a popular explanation of the Holy Eucharist, Dionysius Bar-Salibi, bishop of Emida, denounces the incorruptibility of the Lord's Body before the Resurrection.‡ It would have been possible for a Monophysite to have used almost every word of the hymn, even "perfect God and perfect Man," "without change," however untruthfully, but he never could have called the Sacred Humanity incorruptible when it was born of the Virgin.§

It is quite plain, then, that our hymn could never have been composed or introduced by a Monophysite.|| This, however, is conclusive against its introduction into *Æthiopia* after the Council of Chalcedon; for after that time Monophysites or Catholics were dominant in Alexandria. The Gaianites or Julianists, who alone would have brought in a hymn containing the epithet incorruptible applied to our Lord, were always considered as schismatics in Alexandria, and would therefore have been powerless to introduce into the Church of Axum a liturgical and dogmatic hymn. The Gaianites frequently appear on the stage in Alexandrian history, but always as *mauvais sujets* and dissenters. For one moment after the death of Theodosius, the Monophysite patriarch, in 567, there was an experimental coalition between these two sections of the Jacobites, but it failed at once. The Gaianites had bishops of their own, who were a sore trouble to the Alexandrian patriarch.¶ We hear that there were many of them among the wild monks of Nitria as late as the eighth century; but they were considered out of the Church; when converted, some were even re-baptized.** At the end of that century a second attempt at re-union was made, but it failed, though at first favoured by the Patriarch; henceforth Gaianite bishops are no more heard of.†† In the seventh, Simon, a Jacobite bishop, when interrogated by the Mohammedan emir, professed an impartial abhorrence for Melchites, Bar-sanuphians, and Gaianites. Furthermore, the few transactions on record between the Churches of Alexandria and Axum all

* Gallandius, xii. 736.

† "Assemani," ii. 25. That learned writer seems to be mistaken when (p. 22) he ascribes the doctrine of Julian to Xenias. Certainly the expression quoted does not amount to an agreement with him.

‡ Assemani, ii. 206. Renaudot, 366.

§ Specimens of instances in which the Severians used such language, and even the very *ασνγχωτως*, or without confusion, are to be found in Gallandius, ubi sup. and Assemani, ii. 25, 136. || Assemani, 136, 25.

¶ Renaudot, 153. ** Ib., 195. †† Assemani, tom. ii. Introduction, c. iv.

show that Monophysites and not Gaianites were in power. In a curious account given by Gregory Bar-Hebræus, it is said that the succession of bishops had failed in *Æthiopia* on account of its seclusion from the civilized world, and that its king had applied to Justinian for a patriarch. By a trick, however, of the Empress Theodora, a partisan of her favourite, Theodosius, forestalled the orthodox Metropolitan sent by her husband.

Now, this Theodosius was the very patriarch of Alexandria who was expelled by Gaianus at the head of the Alexandrian mob. If heresy then first came into Abyssinia, it was plainly under Monophysite colours, not under those of *Incorruplicolæ*. In the next century, the patriarch who sent into Abyssinia the father of *Æthiopian* monasticism, and to this day the great legendary saint of the country, Tekla-Haimanoth, was Benjamin, under whom the Monophysites became the established Church of Egypt during the Mohammedan sway. The one moment when it might be argued that the heresy of the *Incorruplicolæ* was dominant was that when that most coxcombical of imperial pedants, Justinian, in the last year of his life, took it into his head to profess that error. We have, however, seen that the Monophysites had already established themselves in the country. Justinian's folly had no influence on the world. His edicts were despised by Catholic and Monophysite. The true faith and heresy alike refused to be bound down by imperial red tape. There is not the most distant proof that Alexandria was in the slightest degree influenced by Justinian's freak. But even if there were, the shock would have been felt but little, if at all, before death rid the Church of him. It took a long time for *Æthiopia* to vibrate to the impulses of the world without. It had long dropped out of the connection with the civilized universe which had touched it in the time of the Ptolemies. It had become again a fabled land of Troglodytes, and men "whose heads beneath their shoulders grow." The chief of the embassy sent by Justinian, even in the meagre analysis of Photius, speaks pathetically of the dangerous savages who had beset his path before he could reach the throne of the Ethiopian king. Justinian had tried to make the country an *entrepot* to favour his monopoly of the silk-trade; but the project utterly failed. Cosmas, the Indian navigator, speaks of it and its hippopotami, and other animals, pretty nearly as Du Chaillu speaks of Central Africa and the gorilla. A few merchants went thither on a six months' voyage every two years, to obtain from the barbarians frankincense and gold, and their primitive mode of barter reminds us of that of the negroes at this day. The unfortunate philo-

sopher Moripius went on a voyage to explore the country as an unknown land, and paid the penalty of his scientific zeal, by falling into the hands of the savage inhabitants. Though probably one month would suffice to travel the thirty stations,* of thirty Roman miles each, from Alexandria to the first cataract, and in one month more the traveller might be at Axum, yet such were the dangers of the way that the common route was the long voyage by the Red Sea. A country such as this would be the very last to be influenced by the old emperor's Gaianism, even if there were proof that it ever reached Alexandria. That it did not even penetrate so far we have the testimony of the Protestant historian of the Eastern Church. "As was his (Justinian's) wont, he published an edict, in which he asserted that new doctrine (of the Incorrupticola), and which he required all the principal bishops to sign. But he prevailed with none; S. Eutychius of Constantinople was sent into exile for his firmness, and the Sees of Antioch, and in all probability Alexandria, severely threatened. But the death of the emperor delivered the Church from persecution on that account."† We may take it for granted that nothing is more improbable than that the Aphthartodocetæ should have had the power to influence in any way the liturgy of Ethiopia.

We may now sum up the result of the evidence which we have collected. The expression which asserts the Incarnation of One Person of the Holy Trinity proves the hymn to be subsequent to the Council of Ephesus, while the absence of all allusion to the duality of natures in our Lord prevents its being later than the epoch of Eutyches. This conclusion is further strengthened by the assertion of the incorruption of the human nature, a phrase which could not have proceeded from either Catholics or Monophysites after the rise of the Incorrupticola; while the circumstance that the hymn is found in *A*Ethiopia shows that the Gaianites themselves could not have introduced it, as they were powerless over the liturgy of a church so strictly dependent on the established Church of Alexandria. Furthermore, the same argument proves that the hymn cannot have suffered interpolation subsequently to the rise of the Monophysites. The occurrence of the passage which asserted the incorruptibility of the sacred humanity is a positive proof that no one can have touched it after the beginning of the sixth century. Any Catholic or any Monophysite who would have inserted the doctrine of the Invocation of Mary

* Gallandius, xi. 420.

† Neale, ii. 34.

would have infallibly banished or qualified the *αρθαρσία*. A negative argument carries back the same proof to the period of the great council. Any one who reads the history of the tumults at Alexandria immediately after Chalcedon will understand that no document containing a statement of the Incarnation could have been meddled with at all without an assertion of Monophysitism. It is quite conceivable indeed that the office of the Mass should have remained untouched, though even that great action was influenced by Eutychianism, for the Armenians mix no water with the wine, because it symbolizes the two natures. But hymns were the especial means of propagating doctrine, and were constantly retouched. Hardly had the Monophysite doctrine risen, when the great hymn of the Trisagion was interpolated, and the interpolation was accepted even by Severus. If either Catholic or heretic had begun to touch our hymn after Chalcedon, the parts which concern the Incarnation must certainly have borne marks of change or additions. While the document, therefore, could not by any possibility be later than the rise of the In corrupticola, in all probability it belongs to the time between the Council of Ephesus and the Council of Chalcedon. It may possibly have been sung in Alexandria in the last years of S. Cyril, and transported from thence to *Æthiopia*. In fact, the hymn is only one of a number of proofs which occur, both among Catholics and heretics, that just before the separation of the great heresy of Eutyches from the Church, a vast increase of devotion to our Blessed Lady had taken place. This is the answer to the question which we placed before ourselves at the beginning of this discussion: how can we account for the remarkable fact that among all the old separated bodies, even Nestorians,* much more among Jacobites of every class, and the schismatic Greeks, there is an extraordinary devotion to the Blessed Virgin? The answer is that they brought it with them from the Catholic Church, prior to their separation. This fact is becoming more and more clear, even among Protestants, however differently it may be stated. Mr. Plumptre† has lately asserted that the devotion to Mary arose among Apollinarians. He might as well say that the knowledge that Jesus had a soul had its origin in Apollinaris. Dorner is too philosophical and too learned to make such a blunder. He also, however, notices the fact

* *Vide* the surprising statement in Mr. Badger's "Nestorians and their Rituals," vol. ii. pp. 51, 307.

† We are bound to acknowledge that we are indebted for the whole of our knowledge of Mr. Plumptre to *The Month*, December, 1867.

that the worship of our Lady *inside the Catholic Church*,* and especially among the monks, increased very much about that time. To this fact he adds a theory that to that devotion the Eutychians owed much of their success. Like a true German, he is right in his fact; like that of many Germans, his theory is a fancy.

We take act of this affirmation of the learned German, and we use it to show that so far from the occurrence of a statement that prayer ought to be addressed to our Lady in a document of the fifth century being a ground for suspicion of interpolation, it is precisely what would be expected. Already, long before that time, she had been invoked, whether rhetorically or not, by S. Hippolytus in a sermon preached at Rome.† Already had S. Ephrem supplicated God to hear him through her prayers. Enough has been said in these pages to throw back her ecclesiastical position from the fifth century, where Father Newman places it, to the third and fourth. That out of the two facts of the direct invocation of her name in sermons, and the use of her prayers, a direct appeal to herself to intercede for us should arise, was quite inevitable. And such we find to be the fact. Theodotus of Ancyra publicly called on our Lady at Ephesus, and broke out into the invocation, "O Virgin! a greater Paradise than Eden." At the same time, he affirms as a fact that he and Christians pray to her. "Hail name of Mary, breathing sweetness," he says; and then adds, "Such wonders is the Divine Virgin Mother ever bringing to us in her holy illuminations. With her is the Fount of Life and breasts of spiritual and guileless milk, from which we now eagerly rush to suck sweetness, not forgetting the past, but also longing for future favours."‡ Who ever more clearly called Mary channel of grace and Mother of Christians? This was in the fifth century. At the end of the same, and the very beginning of the next century, S. Fulgentius exhorts all Christians to invoke her. "Come virgin to a Virgin, come ye who conceive to one who conceived, ye who bear to one who bore, mothers to a mother, young women to the young." In the beginning of the sixth century instances come thick upon us.§ Hermits in the desert and courtiers in the palace invoke her. Anchorets in the wilderness kneel and burn

* *Entwickelungsgeschichte*, ii. 155.

† *Gallandius*, ii. 496.

‡ *Gallandius*, ix. 461. There is some difference of opinion as to the author. The period at which it was written is plainly the time of S. Cyril's reconciliation with the Antiochenes. Compare the doctrine of the Homily with that of S. Cyril's letter to Acacius, ed. Migne, x. 182.

§ *Vide* instances quoted in the Introduction to the "Lives of the Desert Saints."

lamps before her image. Of Narses, the conqueror of Italy, it is said:—"Those who knew him well say how he adored the Deity with supplications and other acts of piety, and how he honoured the Virgin Mother of God that she might openly show him the moment when he should offer battle."* That in the sixth century, three hundred years before what in Anglican cant is called the division of East and West, Christians invoked our Lady in the same way as they do now, is as indisputable a fact as that William the Conqueror won the battle of Hastings. With this fact staring us in the face, what possible reason is there to suspect interpolation when we meet with invocations to Mary in a document of that period?

Let us try, however, to disentangle the small particle of truth contained in Mr. Plumptre's assertion. It seems at first sight a mere blunder to say that Apollinaris, who denied to our Lord a human soul, should have a devotion to His Mother. Over and above this, devotion to our Lady comes to us from all sides and from every quarter—from Catholics, nay even from heretics of every school, from the bitterest opponents as well as the partizans of Apollinaris. Nevertheless, there is just thus much truth in the assertion. It was through the Apollinarian school that the sinlessness of Jesus became first directly the subject of scientific theology; and such was the connection of His sinlessness with that of His mother in the minds of the Fathers, that inevitably the thought of her immaculateness came into prominence. We will conclude this article by the discussion of a document which will throw further light on a part of our hymn on which we have already touched.

There is a very remarkable document attributed by its first editor, the Jesuit Turrianus, to S. Dionysius of Alexandria.† Subsequent criticism has proved that it is a forgery of the fourth century. "It is more possible," says the learned German author of a monograph on S. Dionysius,‡ "to have been written by an Apollinarian, or a precursor of Eutyches, to show that already Nestorius had been contradicted by S. Dionysius of Alexandria, in the person of Paul of Samosata. To us it seems rather to belong to a time when the opinions of Apollinaris were only in course of formation, and to have been written against the germ of Nestorianism, which had

* Evagrius, *Eccl. Hist.*, vi. 24.

† *Epistola aduersus Paulum Samosatensem.* *Vide Opera S. Dionysii.* Rome, 1796, p. 203.

‡ Dittirch, *Dionysius der Grosse von Alexandrien*, p. 127.

already betrayed itself at Antioch in the view of the double Sonship of our Lord.

However this may be, the document belongs to the Apollinarian school, and turns principally upon the reasons of the sinlessness of Jesus. This was the first time that the subject had been made the direct matter of debate. It had indeed been mentioned by Gnostics; it had formed a portion of the Arian controversy. S. Athanasius turns with horror from the assertion that the Divine Word was *τρεπτός*, and His will mutable. Now, however, the Sacred Humanity itself was directly in question. Apollinaris denied to our Lord as man a human intellectual soul, on the ground that every human intellect had freedom of choice, and all human freedom was liable to sin. Human freedom is, according to his theory, the slave of the flesh necessarily; but the writer indignantly repels the notion that our Lord is a *δοῦλος*; He has only the outward form of a slave. Hence He has no human intellect, the place of which is occupied by the Logos. Such is his account of Jesus. Now, on this exemption from slavery it would seem that Mary could have no claim. By all the laws of logic she ought to be a slave, since she at least has human intellect and human freedom. To our utter astonishment, Mary suddenly appears on the scene, and she too is denied to be a slave. "He made not His dwelling in a slave, but in His holy Tabernacle not made with hands, which is Mary the Mother of God. Then in her our King, the King of Glory, became a High Priest, and remains for ever, having once entered into the Holy of Holies."* Elsewhere the writer calls her "a virginal Paradise," and says that "the Divine Word, since He alone knew the mode of this conception and birth, kept His Mother incorrupt, blessed from head to foot." Now we ask what this absolutely exceptional case of a human intellect, contrary to all rules, endowed with a sinlessness parallel to our Lord's, can be but an Immaculate Conception?†

He does not, of course, mean that her innocence was so identical with our Lord's that in her also it was a physical inability to sin. But he did mean that the analogy was so close that she was in a category with Him, apart from all, and that she could no more be called a slave than He. As if to make it clearer, there is the allusion to the Immaculate Eve before original sin, contained in the words "virginal Paradise." This would be in itself sufficient to show that in the mind of the author, Mary's sinlessness was like that of

* Page 261.

† Page 278.

unfallen man in Paradise; in other words, that she was free from original sin. But there is still further proof that, in his view, the sanctification of Mary dates not from the conception of Jesus, but from her own. This point is still more certain from a deeper insight into the Apollinarian view. According to Apollinaris, the Word had been man from all eternity. Man, in the state of pure or fallen nature, was the imperfect man. The Eternal Word, on the contrary, was the only perfect man, being the supernatural *πνεῦμα* or Logos which was wanted to man's perfection. His was the only real archetypal humanity; and as Apollinaris held as a first principle the utter unchangeableness of God, an immutability which forbade even a change of outward relations, he held also that in some real sense the Word was Man from all eternity. Thus the Incarnation, the taking of flesh at a given period of time, would be but a stage in His manhood. He had already possessed real human reason from all eternity. This was without doubt what Apollinaris meant by his view that the Word was eternally man. There was in his mind a strange confusion, or rather an absolute identity of the real and ideal order. What concerns us, however, is the effect of this system on his view of Mary. S. Gregory Nyssen* draws from it the conclusion that he ought to have held her also to be eternally the Mother of God, and to have existed from eternity. It would have been more obvious to conclude that Apollinaris must have held that she was not His Mother at all, but only the Mother of His flesh. The Saint, however, knew his system too well to attribute this to him. Apollinaris was too much influenced by Alexandrian theology not to be a staunch asserter of the term Mother of God. In his mind the Eternal Word was so connected with His Mother, that if He was eternally the ideal, and the real Man, she was eternally His ideal Mother, and the real relation between the two would thus commence from the first moment of her existence. Then would begin for her that connection between her human soul and the Logos which was precisely the supernatural state needed for the perfection of a human being. And in this sense it was that she was not a *δοῦλος*, and that she was a tabernacle not made with hands; that is, she was supernatural in her very making, at the first instant of her creation.

Does it follow from this that the Immaculate Conception

* Gallandius, tom. vi. 527.

dates from Apollinaris? Nothing can be more unphilosophical and unhistorical. Illogically, in the teeth of their own principles, the Apollinarian school is forced by the tradition of the Church to assign to Mary a quite exceptional place, shared by no one but her Son. There was a radiant circle in the mind of the early Church, drawn around the God-Man and His Mother, into which no other being enters. Her sinlessness is paralleled with that of our Lord, and made different from the holiness of every creature but herself. This was the mode in which the Immaculate Conception was expressed by the early Fathers. It was the real living idea out of which sprung the subsequent judgment of the Church. Of course they did not say that she was free from original sin. They did not use the term original sin at all; but they classed her sinlessness in a category apart with that of Jesus. Their very silence shows it. When did they ever say that she was sinless like S. John the Baptist, who was sanctified in his mother's womb? It was the tradition of the Church of Rome, ever ahead of that of all other Churches. We have seen it in Hippolytus, who uses words remarkably like those of the unknown Apollinarian writer. In both there is the reference to the same chapter of the Hebrews, though Mary is in one compared to the ark, in the other to the Tabernacle. In both there is the same connection between the state of Jesus and the state of Mary in regard to sin. In the one case, she is incorrupt like Jesus; in the other, slavery is denied of her as of Jesus. But the clearest passage is that which was quoted in the introduction to the Lives of the Saints of the Desert, from the newly-discovered Nisibene hymns of S. Ephrem. "Thou and Thy Mother," says the Saint, "are the only beings who are beautiful altogether and in every part. For in Thee, Lord, is no stain, and in Thy Mother no taint."* As for the strange doctrine of the eternity of Mary, it is an evident perversion of the tradition of the Church, which we find in S. Irenaeus, that the idea of Mary was already energizing in God's mind before the fall, since for the sake of the thought of the unborn Mary, He forgave

* The note of the editor is as follows:—*Probatione vix eget Ephraemum hoc loco S. Virgini immunitatem ab originali peccato tribuere. Adscribit enim ei talem sanctitatem, quam cum solo Christo participat, quâque omnes reliqui homines carent. Alias autem Ephraem semper primum locum concedit infantibus qui statim post baptismum e vitâ decesserint, eosque omnes sanctos honore et dignitate superare contendit. Si ergo de actuali tantum peccato ageretur, Maria non sola preter Christum hâc immunitate gauderet, sed in eâdem cum infantibus post baptismum mortuis releganda esset* (p. 28).

Eve. Mary had thus already, in the idea of God, the innocence of the unfallen Eve, whom she was to replace.

Our discussion has been long, yet we trust not unfruitful. There is a phenomenon to be accounted for. In those melancholy bodies of fallen Churches all over Asia and Africa we find the same strange devotion to Mary. It is as though on the corpse of some sinful creature, sadly beautiful even in death, there was found a rosary. They could not have borrowed it from each other, for they detested each other more than the Church. Apollinarians of old, Phantasiasts of Armenia, philosophical Monophysites of Alexandria, wild Abyssinians, all have the same devotion to Mary. What is most strange of all, we find a Nestorian* writer advocating the Immaculate Conception. S. Ephrem's tradition is lingering even there. The Roman doctrine is to be found even in the Greek Church; and that the Jacobites did not borrow it from Constantinople, the hatred between Melchites and Copts is a sufficient guarantee. Let us remember also that in the case of heretics this devotion to Mary is in logical opposition to their tenets. Eutyches started with denying that Jesus was of one substance with Mary, as Nestorius with refusing her the title of Mother of God. The devotion to Mary was too strong for them. They could not have been popular without it. Their idea of her is the Catholic view. Consistently with their strange theology, the Abyssinians ought to hold that our Lord was subject to sin; they are withheld from drawing the inference by the fear of staining Mary's sinlessness.† To this day the Abyssinians believe Mary to have existed in Paradise, and that our Lord made a compact there with her about the salvation of the world.‡ Thus in that curious barbarian region, we see Catholic tradition, down to the minutest points, though sadly corrupted. It is strange to find in Abyssinia traces of the views of S. Irenæus on Mary "the advocate of Eve." The germ has fallen on a poisonous soil and has developed badly; but the germ is that which the Apostles sowed, and which the Catholic Church has kept.

All this does not seem to us without its importance. The finding of the apocryphal book of the third or fourth century § by Tischendorf, containing a distinct invocation to our Lady, as well as the doctrine of the Assumption, the Nisibene hymn of S. Ephrem, and even the present *Æthiopic hymn*, must be looked in the face by Anglicans. We are convinced that the

* *Carmina Nisibena*, p. 30.

† *Dorner*, vol. ii. p. 191.

‡ *Highlands of Ethiopia*, ii. 369.

§ *De Dormitione Mariæ. Apocalypses Apocryphæ*, p. 110.

more deeply the Fathers are studied, the more it will be seen that the proofs of early devotion to Mary are far stronger than has been supposed. They must, however, be read philosophically and as a whole. We must learn to enter into their very minds. We must master the world of ancient thought which they inherited from Greek philosophy. Then alone shall we understand the attempts of the Fathers to see how far it can serve as a vehicle for Christian thought—how far it is a dress, all too narrow and poverty-stricken, too shrunk and lean for the grand ideas which came from Heaven. We must learn to think as they thought, and to identify ourselves with the notions of generations long passed away. We must be Alexandrian with S. Athanasius, even Antiochene with Theodore of Mopsuestia. We must even put ourselves into the intellectual state of heresy, to force it to give up the truth which it still preserves in the midst of its corruption. Happy those who have youth and time for the task. Some future university must do this work. It can only be done in a place where men, who have a genuine love for pure science in union with Catholic Truth, have time to study and to think. Oh for a home of learning like the universities of old, where men did something more than prepare young gentlemen for competitive examinations! As for the present writer, with brains wearied out by labours of another kind, he can only sow thoughts, if haply there may be some germ worthy of living to produce fruit. In the meanwhile, because English Catholics have no learned leisure, the attempt at tracing out the development of doctrine, begun by the learning of a Petavius and the genius of a Newman, has fallen into the hands of Mr. Ffoulkes.

AET. III.—THE FIRST AGE OF THE MARTYR CHURCH.

Les Antonins. Par M. LE COMTE DE CHAMPAGNY. Paris : Ambroise Bray.

THE world which Augustus and Tiberius ruled was not conscious of the fact that there was an order of truth, and of morality based upon that truth, the maintenance of which was to be purchased, and cheaply purchased, with the loss of life, or of all that made life valuable. This world was indeed familiar with the thought and with the practice of sacrificing life for one object—an object which collected all the natural affections and interests of a man together, and presented them to him in the most attractive form, his country. Greek and Roman history, and, indeed, the history of all nations up to that time, had been full of instances in which privations and sufferings were endured, and, if necessary, life itself given up for wife and children, for the dear affections of house and home, for friends, for freedom, for fatherland. Man, civilized and uncivilized, was alike capable of this, and capable of it in profusion. Rome had many a Regulus and Sparta many a Leonidas in the humblest ranks of their citizens : Gaul had thousands as noble as Vercingetorex, and Spain not one but many Numantias. Human nature had never been wanting in the courage to die for the visible goods of human life. But to labour, to combat, to endure pain, sorrow, privations, to suffer in every form for the invisible goods of a future life, to recognize, that is, an inviolable order of religion and morality, so far superior to all that a man can grasp and hold in his possession, to wife, children, goods, friends, freedom, and fatherland, and to life adorned and crowned with these, that any or all of these, and life itself, are to be sacrificed for its preservation ; this may be said to be a thought of which the whole heathen world ruled by Augustus and Tiberius was unconscious.* For other reasons also it was

* Tertull. Apol. 50 :—“O gloriā licitam, quia humanā, cui nec prae-
sumptio perdita nec persuasio desperata deputatur in contemptu mortis et
atrocitatis omnimode, cui tantum pro patria, pro imperio, pro amicitia pati
permissum est, quantum pro Deo non licet.”—See again the instances he
collects, ad Martyres, 4 ; and Eusebius Hist. 5, proem. draws the same
contrast.

familiar enough with the sacrifice of life, since the continual practice of war and the permanent institution of slavery had made human life the cheapest of all things in its eyes. And further, to die rather than to live dishonoured was still the rule of the nobler among the millions who yielded to the sway of Augustus. But to die for the maintenance of moral truth, that is, for faith,—this was known indeed to the Jews, who had already their “cloud of witnesses” to it; but it was unknown to heathendom, which has in all its ranks and times but one man* to offer whose death approaches to such a sacrifice, and therefore shines with incomparable lustre among all deeds of purely human heroism. But the death of Socrates found in this no imitators: he created here no line of followers; and he stands alone in this greatness, an exception to an otherwise invariable rule.

However, in our two preceding numbers† we have been describing something much more than the exhibition of this order of truth; that is, we have set forth the union of it with a Person, who both exhibits it in Himself, and is the source of it to others. And the difference between these two things is very great. Many at different times have said, “I teach the truth.” One only has said, “I am the Truth:” and to say it is the most emphatic indirect assumption of Godhead which can be conceived. And with it that One also joined a similar expression, containing the same assumption of Godhead, and which equally was never approached by any other teacher, “I am the Life.” The union of the Truth at once and of the Life with His Person, which is thus become the root of both to human nature, was the subject of the last two papers. Now, as we have said, that there was an order of truth sacred and inviolable above all things, was borne witness to by the Hebrew martyrs, and therefore was not new to the chosen race of Israel, though it was new to heathendom, at the time at which our Lord appeared. But the union of the Truth and of the Life with the Person of One appearing visibly in the world as man, was as new to the Hebrews as to the heathen, was an absolute novelty to human nature. And so the Christian Faith also, as a system of belief and action, that is, as embracing the mind and the will of man, as giving both Truth and Life, is entirely new in this respect; that in this double action it is in its origin and in its whole course and

* Celsus only alleges the suffering of Socrates as a parallel to that of the martyrs.—Origen, c. Cels. 1, 3.

† See “The First and Second Man” and “The Second Man verified in History.”

maintenance bound up with a Person. Thus all which it teaches is not naked truth, unlocalized as it were, and impersonal, but is the development of relations in which the disciples of Christ stand to Him; for instance, as King, as God, as Head, as Bridegroom, as Father. As these, He is at once the Truth and the Life. Thus it is that the Christian Faith flows out of the Person of Christ the God-man; and, as its Truth is centered in that Person, so also its continuous Life depends on Him.

And further, as the connection of doctrine, or truth, and of life, that is, action, with a Person is the point from which all this movement springs, in which respect we have said it was absolutely new, so the term to which it reaches is the creation of something in both these things correlative to that Person, the creation of a Kingdom, a Temple, a Body, a Mother, a Race, in which respect also the term is as new as that from which it springs. That He is the Truth and the Life is shown in this creation, which has a distinctive character, as He has an unique existence, and an organic unity with Him.

The subject on which we are now employed is to describe as an historic fact how the duty of maintaining, propagating, and dying for the truth and conduct thus identified with the Person of Christ, was carried out through many generations and under difficulties which seemed to preclude the possibility of its success; and to show the means by which this great creation, starting from the day of Pentecost, made a home and established itself in the Roman empire, by which, after a conflict of nearly three hundred years, it was finally recognized.

The worship of the one true God had been fixed in the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as the faith which made them a nation, that is, as the dogma on which their national existence was so based, that through maintaining it they were to continue a people. The Jewish polity lived in and by this belief, and, as a nation, was its prophet. Certainly, this was the noblest form which nationalism has ever assumed. Yet it was nationalism still; and the proselyte who would enter into the full worship of the God of Abraham and all its privileges had to become a Jew. But now, instead of this bond another was substituted, signifying that the King of the Jews who had appeared was come as the saviour of *man*, not of this or that nation. The bond is therefore placed at the point which constituted the salvation of the whole race, that is, in the Person of the God-man, and by this the corporation was put beyond the bounds of a nationality, and made co-extensive with the world. The

Christian creed was formed round the Person, the actions, and the sufferings of Christ. Now here, precisely in what constituted the character, the greatness, and the glory of the Christian faith, was seated the principle and the beginning of the persecution which it encountered from the Roman empire. In that empire every species of idolatry* had a right of homestead as the national or tribe religion of any one of its constituent parts; and the worship of even one God, exclusive as that Jewish worship was of the whole heathen pantheon, was allowed by the laws of Rome to the Jews, because He was considered their national god. But the Christians had no such justification in Roman eyes for their exclusive worship. They were not a nation nor a province of the empire; they had not, therefore, that title for their worship which constituted the charter of toleration to all besides, including the Jew, who worshipped the same God. For the Christians worshipped Him, not as their ancestral God, but as the Father of that Son who had taken human flesh, and become the Saviour of men. Their worship of the one true God was not only exclusive, but in and through the fact of the Incarnation claimed the homage of all men to it. It knew of no bond of brotherhood but in Him who had deigned to call men His brethren. Thus its special character and pre-eminent glory was the cause of its persecution, and from the moment that it came before the notice of the Roman governor, not as a Jewish sect but as a distinct belief, it was considered as not a lawful religion. Thus, too, it was that the selfsame point which kindled Jewish hatred entailed Roman persecution. The Christian faith was a mortal offence to the Jew because it extended what had been his special privileges to all the Gentiles. He abhorred the substitution of the Person of the God-man for the race of Abraham after the flesh; as the Roman at once despised and hated a worship which not only adhered to one God, but dethroned from his political supremacy the capitoline Jupiter, and whose title rested not on tradition and national inheritance, but on a fact touching the whole race of man, and therefore claiming the allegiance of

* With an appeal to this fact, Athenagoras begins his apology to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, about A.D. 177. *ἴνι λόγῳ κατὰ ιθην καὶ δήμους θυσίας κατάγοντιν ἀς ἀθέλωσιν ἄνθρωποι καὶ μνοτήρια. οἱ δὲ Αιγύπτιοι καὶ αἰλούρους καὶ κροκοδείλους καὶ ὄφεις καὶ ἀσπίδας καὶ κύνας θεοὺς νοοῦσσοι. καὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν ἐπερρέπετε καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ οἱ νόμοι ήμιν δὲ (καὶ μὴ παρακρονοθήγε, ὡς οἱ πολλοί, οἱ ἀκοῆς) τῷ ὄντοματι ἀπειχάνεσθε.*—Ch. i. See also Kellner's *Hellenismus und Christenthum*, p. 79; and Champagny, *Les Antonins*, ii. 189.

the whole race—the assumption of human nature by a divine Person. Thus the doctrine in which lay the whole creative force, the truth and the life of Christianity, was that which from the first caused the dislike of the Jew and the persecution of the Gentile—the kingship of Christ, involving the headship of a universal religion, and a power which was not that of Cæsar.

We have, then, now to treat of a period of 280 years, homogeneous in its character from the beginning to the end, which is, that it is the carrying out by a people ever increasing in number and strength of that good confession made before Pontius Pilate—that witness at its proper time of which S. Paul* in its first stage said that he was the herald and apostle. The course and life of Christians during these ten generations is to be the prolongation of this testimony, the embodiment of this confession. It is as soldiers, imitators, followers of one Chief, that all appear on the scene in their respective order.† It is by a direct virtue drawn from the cross of that Chief that they move onward to their own passion. They endure and they conquer simply as under His command, and because He endured and conquered before them. Their oath of military fidelity is the bond of their discipline; they prevail because they are His, and because they are one in Him.

And they stand in glittering ring
Round their warrior God and King—
Who before and for them bled—
With their robes of ruby red,
And their swords of cherub flame.

The whole process and cause of Christians during this long period, the ground of their accusation, the conduct and principles of the judges, and their judgment, are summed up as in a parable in that scene which passed before Pilate, while the subsequent day of Pentecost is in the same manner an image of the final result won in these three hundred years. For as the crucifixion of the Truth in the Person of Christ is followed by the descent of the Holy Ghost forming the Church, so the persecution and crucifixion of the truth in ten generations of His people is followed by the empire's public

* 1 Tim. vi. 13; ii. 6.

† *Æmulos nos ergo Sibi esse voluit, ac primus virtute coelesti injustorum justus obtemperavit arbitrio; dans scilicet secuturis viam, ut pius Dominus exemplum famulis Se præbendo, ne onerosus præceptor a quodam putaretur. Pertulit ante illa quæ aliis preferenda mandavit.*—Epist. Ecc. Smyr., i. Ruinart, p. 31.

recognition of His eternal kingdom—of that Body of Christ seen visibly in a council of its prelates assembling freely from all lands.

Take first the seventy years which form the Apostolic age. What do we find as the result when S. John, the last apostle, is taken away? In a large number of cities throughout the Roman empire a community has been planted after the pattern of that which we have described as arising at Jerusalem, and by the same means, the power of oral teaching. Every such community has at its head its bishop, or angel, who sums up and represents in his own person the people over which he presides. This is exactly the picture presented to us at the close of this period by S. John in the Apocalypse, when he is directed by our Lord personally appearing to him to write seven letters to as many bishops of cities on the sea-board of the province of Asia. Each, with his people, is addressed as a unit. One, "I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy endurance, and how thou canst not bear those which are evil;" a second, "Fear not what thou art about to suffer; behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison;" a third, "I have against thee some few things, that thou hast there some who hold the doctrine of Balaam."† Each has around him his council of priests, his ministering deacons, his faithful people. The last apostle is still living; but in all these communities many exist, both of teachers and taught, who have learned Christian doctrine, either from the mouth of an apostle or the comrade of an apostle—a Mark, a Luke, a Silvanus, a Clemens. Thus they live mainly upon oral teaching: the voice which went forth from the day of Pentecost is sounding freshly in their ears. Doctrine is in the stage of simple tradition and authority. The writings of the New Testament are completed, but being addressed to various parts of the Church, are best known to those for whom they were written. They are not yet collected and made the common patrimony of the whole Church. S. John leaves the earth without performing any such function; without setting the seal of his apostolical authority upon the New Testament as a whole; nay, the authorship of some of his own writings, as we now receive them, will be partially contested after his death before their final reception. Of the absolute number of these Christian communities, and of the multitude they severally embrace, we have no account; we can form no estimate, save to infer that the whole number of the faithful, at the end of this period, was very small in comparison with the mass out of which

† Apoc. ii. 2, 10, 14.

they had been drawn. Still it was a germ with a living force of expansion, planted in every considerable spot of the empire; and wherever it was planted, a Christian people, in the full sense of the word, existed, having a complete spiritual life of its own, possessing the sacraments which insured the beginning and the continuance of that life, an order of worship based on the great central fact which made them a people, and a ministry charged with the power to teach and to convey on to their successors the doctrines delivered to them.

But in the mean time how had the empire treated it? In these seventy years it has traversed the seven last years of the Emperor Tiberius, and the whole principates of Caligula, Claudius, and Nero; the revolutionary crisis in which Galba, Otho, and Vitellius reigned for an instant, and then the settled time of Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, and Nerva. Now, during this period its treatment by the empire has been a singular reproduction of what passed in the hall of Pilate. For the Jewish religion was one allowed by Roman law. The profession of it entailed no penalty. Now the first heralds of the Gospel, as Jews, preached their message boldly and publicly, and in doing so it does not seem that Roman law would have interfered with them.* At this stage it looked upon Christians as a sect of Jews. As no authority of the empire had interfered with the public ministry of our Lord, so it would seem to have left the ministry of His disciples in the first instance free. It is from another quarter that opposition arises. The Jew in his jealous anger at the promulgation of a Messiah and a spiritual kingdom which is not after Jewish taste, both because it is a kingdom not of this world, and because it raises the Gentile to co-inheritance with the race of Abraham, drags the Christian missionary before the tribunal of the Roman magistrate and imputes to him "seditio." Then many a Gallio, many a Felix, many a Festus have as it were unwillingly to enter into and decide these questions of the Jewish law. It would seem that converts to the Christian faith in these its earliest days might long have escaped the notice of the magistrate, as belonging to a Jewish sect, but for this enmity of the Jews themselves. But as the teachers of the new faith everywhere addressed themselves first to their countrymen, so everywhere they found these countrymen alive to their progress and bitterly set against it.† This state of

* This is what Tertullian calls "Sub umbraculo insignissimæ religionis, certe licetæ;" and ad Nationes, i. 11, "Nos quoque ut Judaicæ religionis propinquos."

† See Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. 17, who speaks of the Jews as sending everywhere deputies in order to defame Christians.

things is pretty well expressed by that answer of the Roman Jews to S. Paul when he excuses himself before them for having been compelled to appeal to the Emperor Nero : "as concerning this sect, we know that it is spoken against everywhere."* This, however, was Jewish, not Roman, contradiction. So far as everywhere Jewish hatred and jealousy could malign and counter-work the progress of the Christian Faith, and bring suffering on its teachers, it had been done. But nevertheless with this exception it would seem that for thirty-five years after the day of Pentecost that Faith had been freely and publicly taught throughout the empire. It was through the malignity of his own countrymen, stirring up a dangerous conspiracy against him, that S. Paul felt himself compelled to appeal to the emperor, and the result of his appeal was that he was set free. But in the year 64 another state of things had arisen. The ruin of a large part of Rome by fire had brought a great odium upon Nero. Now his wife Poppaea is said to have been a Jewish proselyte, he himself to have been surrounded by Jewish influences, and nothing is more probable than that Jewish hatred, which had tracked the Christians everywhere, pursued them especially here, and suggested them to him both as authors of the conflagration, and as convenient scapegoats whereon to divert the odium against himself which had arisen from it. Thus he took the opportunity of exposing to shame and torment, as victims of the popular dislike, and in popular opinion guilty of "hatred of the human race," or of being hated by them "a vast multitude"† of Christians, who, says the heathen historian, were put to the most exquisite suffering, being wrapt in the skins of wild beasts, and torn to pieces by dogs, or crucified, or clothed in garments of pitch, and set on fire to illuminate the night. Thus it is, as decorations of Nero's games, in his gardens of the Vatican, where the obelisk from Heliopolis, once the ornament of his circus, now bears witness to the victory of Christ, that Christians first come before us in the pages of Roman historians, just at the middle of the period we are now describing, thirty-five years after the ascension.

It may be considered part of this first persecution that the two great Apostles—Peter who had founded the Roman Church, and Paul who after its first foundation had helped to build it up—were condemned in the last year of Nero, and by his deputies ‡ during his absence, to suffer as Christians, the one

* Acts xxviii. 22.

† Tacitus, Ann. xv. 44.

‡ Ο Παῦλος, μαρτυρήσας ἵπι τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου.—S. Clem. Rom. ad Cor. 5.

the death of a Roman citizen by the sword, and the other that of a slave by crucifixion. Thus the two great brethren by enduring together the martyr's death, the highest mark of Christian charity, sealed their joint foundation of Christian Rome, that like as the Rome which had gained the conquest of the world by the strong hand of violence, had been planted in the blood of one brother shed by another, so the Rome which was to be the centre of Christ's kingdom, and in the words of S. Ignatius "preside over charity," should have for her founders brethren in supernatural love, pouring forth their blood together for the seat of that Christian unity which binds the earth in one.

But this persecution by Nero is not transitory in its consequences. The emperor had judged that Christians as such professed a religion not allowed by the Roman laws, and were guilty therein of a capital crime. This crime, if technically expressed, would amount to sacrilege and treason;* for they could not acknowledge the Roman gods as gods, nor the emperor as Pontifex Maximus; nor could they swear by his genius, which was the oath expressing fidelity to the Roman constitution in its civil and religious aspect. This was that "hatred of the human race," that is, in other words, of the Roman empire, of which in the eyes of Tacitus and Pliny, of Nero now, and of Trajan afterwards, they were guilty as Christians. But the singular thing is this, that the Jew, who was the first to drag them before the Roman tribunal, who was their omnipresent, ever-ready antagonist and traducer, though he worshipped one only God, though he abhorred the whole Roman polytheism, though he swore not by the genius of the emperor, was exempt from punishment: his religion was recognized by Roman law and the senate its interpreter, because it was the national and time-honoured religion of a constituent part of the empire. On the same ground the vilest Egyptian, Asiatic, African idol was allowed the worship of those who claimed it as their ancestral god. The Christian Faith was the sole exception to this universal tolerance, because it was not the religion of a subject nation, because it was new, because, in fine, it rested on principles which, if carried out, would sweep away the whole fabric of polytheism on which the Roman State rested. And the act of Nero had its great importance in that it formally distinguished the Christian from the Jewish

* Tertull. Apol. 10. *Sacrilegii et majestatis rei conveniuntur: summa haec causa, immo tota est.*—Lassaulx says, "die beiden Hauptanklagen, die Religion-verachtung, die Majestäts-beleidigung."—Fall des Hellenismus, p. 11.

religion, and took away from it by a legal decision of the State's highest authority the claim to be considered "licit."

Nero then bestows the crown of martyrdom on S. Peter and S. Paul, and on what Tacitus calls, even within Rome alone, a vast multitude. But he does more than this. On the first appearance of Christians before the supreme authority he so applies an existing law to their case, as to establish their liability under it to capital punishment; and this liability rests upon them henceforth down to the time of Constantine. It is by no means always carried out; it is often suspended, sometimes for many years together, according to the character of the ruling prince, or the maxims of his government, or the state itself of the empire. But it is henceforth the legal position of Christians. It is a danger which besets their condition, and may be called into action at any moment, in any city of the empire, from any motive of private enmity, cupidity, or passion. It is the legal Roman equivalent and interpretation of their Master's words, "You shall be hated of all men for my name's sake."*

How often, and in how many instances, it was carried out in this period of seventy years, we have no means of telling; but another emperor is named as a persecutor. Domitian not only put to death as Christian his cousin, the Consul Flavius Clemens, but, as it would seem, a great many others at Rome, in the latter years of his principate.† Domitian and Nero are mentioned as persecutors by Melito when addressing Marcus Aurelius, and by Tertullian,‡ in the time of Severus, though it was the object of both to make the emperors appear to have been not unfavourable to Christians. But, independent of any general act which would constitute an emperor a persecutor,§ this liability to punishment,|| in

* Matt. x. 22; xxiv. 9.

† S. Clemens Rom., writing just after Domitian's time, associates as sufferers with S. Peter and S. Paul in his own time, πόλιν πληῆδος ἐκλεκτῶν, οἵτινες πόλλας αἰκίας καὶ βασάνους ἔιά ζῆδον παθόντες ὑποδείγμα καλλιστον ἰγίνοντο ἐν ἡμῖν.—Ad Cor. 6.

‡ Euseb. Hist. iv. 25; Tertull. Apol. 5.

§ In Tertullian's words, "debellator Christianorum," Apol. 5.

|| Thus a late Protestant writer, Schmidt (Geschichte der Denk und Glau-bensfreiheit, p. 165), remarks of the condition of Christians, "Vollkommen gewiss ist, dass unter Domitian eine neue Drangperiode für die Christen begann, die sich in Verfolgungen, in Hinrichtungen, und Verbannungen äusserte. (Dio. 67, 14, und die Ausleger.) Damals soll auch der Apostel Johannes nach Patmos verwiesen worden sein. Erst Nerva lüftete wiederum diesen Druck, indem er den Verhafteten die Freiheit gab, und die Verbannten zurückberief. (Dio. 68, 1.) *Es war dies aber doch nur als eine Amnestie, als ein Gnadenact anzusehen, nicht als eine Anerkennung der*

virtue of which the confessor or martyr was brought before the local magistrates, was that under which individual Christians, in most peaceful times, and in the reign of emperors generally just and moderate, endured their sufferings. The Emperor Tiberius is said by Tertullian to have brought before the senate a proposition to allow the Christian faith as a lawful religion. Had this been done, the whole course of Christian history in these three centuries would have been changed. As it was, every one, in becoming a Christian, accepted the chance that he might thereby be called upon to forfeit the possession of wife, children, goods, every civil right and life itself.

The end of the reign of the first Antonine, in the year 161, furnishes us with a second fitting epoch at which we may estimate the growth and position in the empire of the Christian Faith.

During the sixty years which elapse from the death of S. John to the accession of Marcus, the Roman empire is ruled by three sovereigns, who have each left a fair name and a considerable renown behind them, and who, compared with most of those who preceded or who followed them, may almost be termed great. Trajan by his military successes raised to the highest point the credit of the Roman arms; by his moderation in civil government effaced the remembrance of Domitian's cruelties, and gave the Romans perhaps as much liberty as they could bear. His successor Hadrian, joining great energy, administrative ability, and moderation of his own to the fear and respect for the Roman name, which the powerful arm of Trajan had spread around, was able at once to exercise his army with unwearied discipline, and to maintain the empire at its full tide of power in honourable peace, while Antoninus crowned the forty years of equable and generally just government—bestowed on the Roman world by Trajan and Hadrian—with a further happy period of more than half that length, wherein the glory of the empire may be said to have culminated. Imperial Rome never saw again such a day of power, or such a prospect of security as when Antoninus celebrated the secular games at the completion of nine hundred years; and for ages afterwards his name carried respect, and men looked back on his reign as on an ideal period of happiness for those whom he ruled.

One of the most competent observers of our time has marked the last ten years of the reign of Pius as the period

at which the independent development of Graeco-Roman heathenism terminated, when it had exhausted all the forms of its own inward life, since the Neoplatonic philosophy which is the only striking product of intelligence that arises afterwards, is manifestly due to the antagonism with Christianity, and is no pure offspring of the heathen spirit.* From this time forth Christian influences become unmistakable in their action upon heathen thought and society. This, then, affords another reason why we should endeavour to trace the progress and extension which the Church had reached at this point.

Now a contemporary of Antoninus declares that in his time, that is, about the year 150, there was no race of men, either barbarians or Greeks, none even of Scythian nomads roaming in waggons, or of pastoral tribes dwelling in tents, among whom prayers and thanksgivings were not offered to the Father and Creator of the universe in the name of the crucified Jesus.† Thus, in a hundred and twenty years the Church had outstripped the limits of the empire. The germ which in the time of S. John was rooted in the chief cities, had spread out thence and increased, taking more and more possession of the soil in all directions. Still we must consider the Christian Church in each place of its occupation as a small minority of the people: nor is there any reason to doubt the statement made by Celsus, that at the period when he wrote, the middle of the second century, the Christian faith counted few of the educated, distinguished, and rich, among its adherents,‡ for Origen, in replying to him, alleges no specific example to the contrary. Yet, here too we must consider the justice of Origen's remark, § that these classes are everywhere few in proportion to the poor and ignorant, and that Christianity being the day-star arising on every soul took of all classes alike. So much, then, as to the Church's material extension; now as to its internal growth.

As this period opens, comrades of the apostles still abound in the churches. We know of several instances wherein such persons hold eminent rank. At Rome, S. Clement is the third successor of S. Peter; and S. Irenæus,|| recording him

* Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, Vorwort iv.

† Justin, *Dialog. with Tryphon*, 117.—Tertullian, 50 years later, *adv. Iudeos* 7, goes beyond this.

‡ Kellner, *Hellenismus und Christenthum*, p. 85.

§ Origen, *cont. Cels.* i. 27.

|| Lib. iii. 3. "Ἐτι ἐναντὸν τὸ κήρυγμα τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τὴν παράδοσιν πρὸ δοθαλμῶν ἔχων, οὐ μόνος, ἐτι γάρ πολλοὶ ἐπελείποντα τότε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων δεδιδαγμένοι; where τὸ κήρυγμα and ἡ παράδοσις τῶν ἀποστόλων indicate the whole body of truth which they communicated to the Church, whether written or unwritten.

as such, eighty years afterwards, specially notes that he had seen and lived with apostles, and had their preaching still sounding in his ears, and their tradition before his eyes ; at Antioch, S. Ignatius, second after the same S. Peter ; in the See of Jerusalem, S. Simeon, the brother of James, still survives ; at Smyrna, S. John's disciple Polykarp is bishop. Many more such S. Irenæus declares that there were. This would prepare us for the strength with which the principle of authority and tradition was held, and show how completely the sense of a spiritual government, of cohesion, and continuity of moral life, and of a common doctrine and teaching, the foundation of these, prevailed. But we are not left to inferences, we have the clearest statements on this point about fifteen years after S. John's death. It has been remarked above how in the Apocalypse our Lord himself, addressing the seven churches, gathers them up in their bishops, and speaks of them each collectively, as of one person. In the year 116, as is supposed, Ignatius still after forty-eight years bishop of one of the three great mother churches, all of them Sees of Peter, and types and models of church government, whence missions went forth, and the layers of apostolic teaching were propagated, in his seven extant epistles conveys the same idea as that presented by those divine words which S. John had heard in vision, and was commanded to record, but with much greater detail. As he is being led to martyrdom, in the long transit between Antioch and Rome, he pours forth the earnestness of one under sentence of death, glowing at the prospect of shedding his blood for Christ, and being for ever united with Him. These letters remain as a sample of numberless conversations held with the deputations which came to meet him on his way, mingling their tears at his approaching passion with their exultation in his triumph. They are of one tissue throughout. Ignatius dwells with incessant repetition upon union with God and with Christ through obedience to the hierarchy of bishops, priests, and deacons, by maintenance of one faith, in one body of the Church, which is wherever Christ is.* Let us take one instance from his letter to the Ephesians. After saying that he had " received their whole multitude in the person of Onesimus their bishop," he continues :—

It is, then, fitting that you should by all means glorify Jesus Christ who has glorified you ; that by a uniform obedience you may be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, and may all speak alike concerning everything, and that being subject to the bishop and the presbytery, you may be altogether sanctified. I am not giving you com-

* S. Ign. ad Smyrn. 1, and 8.

mands, as if I were any one ; for, though I am in bonds for His name, I am not yet perfected in Jesus Christ. For now I begin to learn, and I speak to you as my fellow-disciples, for I had need to be encouraged by you in faith, exhortation, endurance, long suffering. But since charity suffers me not to be silent to you, I have taken on me to exhort you to run together all with the mind of God. For Jesus Christ, your inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, as also the bishops, placed in their several limits, are the mind of Jesus Christ. Therefore you should run together with the bishop's mind, as indeed you do. So then in your concord and harmonious charity Jesus Christ is sung. And each several one of you makes up the chorus ; so that all being harmonious in concord, you take up the melody in unity, and sing with one voice through Jesus Christ to the Father, that He may hear you, and perceive by your good works that you are members of His Son. It is good for you then to be in blameless unity, that you may always have fellowship with God.

And then he adds :—

For if I in a short time have had such familiarity with your bishop, and that not human, but spiritual, how much more should I think you happy, who are so fused with him as the Church with Jesus Christ, and as Jesus Christ with the Father, that all things may be accordant in unity—(S. Ignat. ad Ephes. i.—iv).

This is an incidental passage out of a very short letter, in which the speaker is addressing practical exhortations to the people of a great church, founded by S. Paul about sixty years before, dwelt in by S. John up to about fifteen years of the time at which he was speaking. We should not in such a writing expect S. Ignatius to speak with the scientific correctness of a theologian, nor is he completely exhibiting his subject in a treatise ; yet here, as it were at the first moment after the Apostles have left the earth, we have a picture of the Church as a world-wide institution, held together by a Divine unity, which has its seat in the Person of Christ as the mind of the Father. It is a composite unity which is contemplated in the image of a harp with its strings pouring forth one song—the song of Christ—to the Father. It is a unity wide as the earth ; for the bishops, placed in their several limits, constitute the mind of Christ, Who is Himself the Father's mind. It is the unity of the diocese, for it is summed up in the bishop : but it is the unity likewise of the whole Church, for the bishops are linked together in One whose mind they collectively represent, and that One is He from whose Person their authority radiates ; in whom, as he says in this same letter, “the old kingdom was being destroyed, God appearing in the form of a man, unto the newness of eternal life.”* Again, it is not

* Ad Ephes. xix.

merely an outward unity of government, but an inward unity of the truth held in common, and also held as given by authority: not truth, as a result of the curiosity of the human intellect, rather truth, as a participation in the mind of Christ. Thus the Catholic unity of government is at the same time a unity of belief which two unities are not, in fact, separable, for their principle is one in the Person of Christ, in respect of whom submission to the Ruler is one and the same thing with belief in the truth revealed by Him, who is King no less than Word, Word no less than King.

We have, then, here the principle of authority and tradition as seated in the hierarchy, and at the same time the whole order and unity of the Church as girdling the world by its chain of the Episcopate, and as possessing the truth and exhibiting it in its quality of an institution. It is before us and at work in its succession of men, in its sacraments which they administer,* in its truth which is imparted by the one and delivered by the other. It is no vague congeries of opinions held by individuals with the diversity of individuals, but a body strongly organized, and possessing an imperishable life, the life of its Author. And we have all this mentioned as fulfilled at the distance of one life from our Lord's ascension, while, indeed, his kinsman and elder in age, S. Simeon, is still bishop of Jerusalem, and mentioned by one of whom a beautiful, though insufficiently grounded legend, says that he was that child whom our Lord had called and placed before His disciples as the model of those who should enter into His kingdom. He was at least so near in time to Christ that this could be said of him. He is the bishop of Antioch; he is on his way to be thrown to the beasts in the Colosseum at Rome;† he is welcomed on his way by church after church, and he sees and describes the bishops, in their several boundaries through the earth, as each maintaining the mind of Christ in the unity of his Body.

Such is the Church merely stated as a fact towards the beginning of the second century.

* Another point on which S. Ignatius dwells repeatedly is the receiving the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist: thus he says of the heterodox, ad Smyrn. 6:—"They abstain from the Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is that flesh of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which in His goodness the Father raised."

† He says, ad Rom. ii. "Οτι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας ὁ Θεὸς κατηξίωσεν εὑρεθῆναι εἰς ὅσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς μεταπεμψάμενος." Merivale, Hist., c. lxv. p. 150, note 1, says, "We are at a loss to account for the bishop being sent to suffer martyrdom at Rome." This passage in the epistle confirms the acts of martyrdom.

And the trial which in these sixty years the Church was going through was well calculated to test her constitution. It is against the spread of false doctrine that S. Ignatius in these epistles so constantly appeals to the unity of the faithful among each other.* He warns them to use only Christian nourishment, and to abstain from strange food, which is heresy.† The Church was then continually receiving into her bosom converts at all ages of life, some from the Jews, many more from the Gentiles; among these, therefore, minds brought up in Jewish prejudices, and others which had run havoc in eastern superstitions and systems of philosophy. In the course of these sixty years she probably multiplied many times over in numbers; and the multiplication was rather by the accession of adults than by the education of children born of Christian parents. The Church was composed of a small minority of the general population scattered at wide intervals over an immense empire; and, so far from being assisted by the civil power, was under constant persecution from it. Whatever force her spiritual government possessed could be exercised only by the voluntary submission of her members. Let us weigh the fact that, under these circumstances, a number of heresies arose. Some were of Jewish, some of Gentile parentage. But we are not here concerned either with their cause or with their matter: we dwell at present only on the fact of their existence. In number they were many; in character most diverse; they arose and flourished in different places. Hardly anywhere was the Church free from them. Let us ask only one question here: by what power were they resisted? The human mind had then the fullest liberty of action in Christians. It was by a free choice—a choice accompanied with danger, and persisted in through suffering, that men became Christians. The liberty which men exercised in becoming Christians they could use further against Christian doctrine, by innovating; by mixing it up with other doctrines, with which, perhaps, their minds had been familiar before their conversion; by developing it after their own fashion. The desire of fame, the self-will of genius, the mere luxury of thought, would offer a continual temptation to such a course. Many, from one motive or another, fell into it. The question which we repeat is, what power prevented the one Church from breaking up under this process of free thought into fragments? These heresies began even while the Apostles were teaching. S. Peter, S. Paul, and S. John speak strongly against them. They swarm in the two generations succeeding the death of

* See Epist. ad Magnes. 13.

† Ad Trall. 6.

S. John. How is it that, at the accession of Marcus Aurelius, Christians having passed the limits of the empire, and being found so far as the wandering tribes of the north, there is still one Church, surrounded, indeed, by a multitude of sects, differing from her and from each other, but herself distinguished and unmistakable among them all? We think the epistles of S. Ignatius furnish us with a reply to this question. As we have seen above, he views the Church in each place as a community closely bound together under a spiritual government which is summed up in the bishop, while the bishops in their several dioceses are as closely linked to each other, and all form one society, wherein is Jesus Christ. And these two truths are not separated from each other, but the unity of the part is deduced from the unity of the whole, and is subordinate to it. See, first, with what force he states the unity of the diocese.* "Avoid divisions as the beginning of evils. Follow all of you the bishop as Jesus Christ the Father, and the presbytery as the apostles, and reverence the deacons as God's command. Let no one without the bishop do aught of what appertains to the Church. Let that be deemed a sure Eucharist which is under the bishop, or under him who has the bishop's authority for it. Wherever the bishop appears there let the multitude (of the faithful) be." But this strict unity of the diocese is derived from that of the whole Church, for he adds as the reason of the foregoing, "just as wherever Jesus Christ is there is the Catholic Church."† This is the first time when the word "catholic" is known to be used, and it is applied to the Church as its distinctive character, to convey the two attributes of unity and universality, in connection with the Person of Christ, exactly as it has been used, an unique term for an unique object, from that day to this. S. Ignatius further views the Church in each place as having one faith; and not only so, but the same faith in every place; one faith at Antioch, one at Rome, one at every city between them, beyond them, around them. Here, then is a double unity, inward and outward. As the double unity of body and spirit makes the man, so the double unity of government and of faith makes the Church. As neither mind nor body alone make the man,

* Ad Smyrn. viii.

† Compare with this expression of S. Ignatius that of the Church of Polycarp, fifty years later, describing how after his martyrdom, *σὺν τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις καὶ πᾶσι δικαιοῖς ἀγαλλιώμενος, δοξάζει τὸν Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα, καὶ ἐνλογεῖ τὸν Κόριον ἡμῶν καὶ κυβερνήτην τῶν (ψυχῶντε καὶ) σωμάτων ἡμῶν, καὶ ποιέι τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.*—Acta Polycarpi, xix., Ruinart, p. 45.

so neither faith nor government alone make the Church, but the coherence of both. The Incarnation is the joining a human soul and body with the person of the Divine Word; after which pattern the Church, which is His special creation, is the joining of one faith and one government in a moral unity. It is by this force, by the same hierarchy everywhere guarding the same faith, by the principle of authority and tradition planted in this one living organization throughout the earth, that the attacks of heresy are everywhere resisted. What S. Paul* lays down in dogma, history exhibits in fact. A hundred years after his words are written, the Church has stretched her limits beyond the empire, has multiplied incessantly, has been attacked by a crowd of heresies striving to adulterate her doctrine, and has cast them out of her by this double unity of her faith and her government, and so is one Body and one Spirit. Her victory lies not in being without heresies, but in standing among them as a contrast and a condemnation.

The solidity of internal organization, and the definiteness of the One Faith which animated it, kept pace with the material increase of numbers. At the expiration of this period it is probable that among all the contemporaries and immediate disciples of the apostles one only of high rank remained, that Polykarp, joint-hearer with Ignatius of S. John, and to whom in his passage the martyr addressed a letter as well as to his Church; whose own letter written at the time of his martyrdom, and commemorating the wonderful patience therein shown forth, is yet extant. But in the mean time in every Church the transmission of authoritative teaching passed to those who had grown up themselves in the bishop's council —his presbytery, which Ignatius loved to represent as being to each bishop what the Council of Apostles was to their Lord. And as the death of apostles themselves had caused no break in this living chain, so the gradual departure of their immediate disciples was made up by the careful handing on of the same deposit, lodged securely in its receptacle, the succession of men, which carried on the teaching office of the Church.†

In the mean time, what was the attitude of the empire to the Christian Faith under Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus

* Ephes. iv. 4-16.

† See Eusebius, Hist., iii. 37, who speaks exactly in this sense; and an important passage in Döllinger, *Kallistus und Hippolytus*, 338-343, on the force of the word *προσβίτερος*, as Ecclesiae Doctor, one particularly charged with the magisterium veritatis. See also Hagemann, *die Römische Kirche*, p. 607-8.

Pius? Domitian's reign had ended in active persecution, to which Nerva had put a stop on his accession.* But though Domitian's edicts had been reversed, like those of Nero, one of the most ancient laws of the Roman empire forbade the worship of any god not approved by the Senate.† This, as we have said above, was the sword perpetually suspended over the heads of Christians, without any fresh action on the part of the emperors. By virtue of this, even when it was forbidden to accuse them, yet if they were brought before justice it was forbidden to absolve them.‡ And even senators,§ if accused, were not exempt from this severity. We find Trajan acting upon this law in the year 111, when Pliny, being governor of Bithynia, brings expressly the case of the Christians before him. And the terms in which he does this show at once the temper of the Roman magistrate in such cases and the state of the law.

I have never been present [he says] at the trials of Christians, and therefore do not know either the nature of their crime, or the degree of the punishment, or how far examination should go. And I have been in great hesitation whether age made any difference, or the tender should not be distinguished from the strong; whether they should be pardoned upon repentance, or, when once a man had been a Christian, ceasing to be so should not profit him; or whether the mere profession without any crime, or whether the crimes involved in the profession should be punished. In the mean time, with regard to those brought before me as Christians, my practice has been this: I asked them if they were Christians. If they admitted it, I put the question a second and a third time, threatening them with death. If they persevered, I ordered them to be led away to execution.|| For whatever it

* Tillemont, *Ecc. Hist.*, ii. 132.

† Tertull., *Apol.* 5, and Euseb. *Hist.* v. 21, assert the existence of this law.

‡ Tillemont, *E. H.* ii. 182-3.

§ See the singular instance given by Euseb. v. 21, in the reign of Commodus. An informer accuses Apollonius of being a Christian, at a time when the imperial laws made such an accusation a capital offence. The accuser is put to death; but Apollonius, who is supposed to have been a senator, having made a brilliant defence before the Senate, suffers martyrdom.

|| *Duci jussi* (confer, *Acts*. xii. 19, *ικλειστενοις διπαχθηναι*). The extreme brevity with which the most urbane, kind-hearted, and accomplished of Roman gentlemen, as Mr. Merivale conceives him, describes himself as having ordered a number of men and women to be put to death for the profession of Christianity, is remarkable and significant. Compare it with the bearing of his friend Trajan to S. Ignatius below. As soon as the saint's confession of "bearing the crucified on his heart" is specific, Trajan without a word of remark orders his execution. The "duci jussi" of Pliny, and Trajan's manner in sentencing, perfectly correspond and bear witness to each other's authenticity. So later the like tone used by Junius Rusticus, prefect of the city under Marcus Aurelius, to Justin Martyr.

was which they were confessing, I had no doubt that stubbornness and inflexible obstinacy deserved punishment. There were others of a like infatuation, but as being Roman citizens I directed them to be sent to the city. Presently the crime spreading, from being under prosecution, as is usual, several incidents happened. An anonymous delation was sent in to me, containing the names of many who say that they are not Christians, nor ever were. As at my instance they invoked the gods, and made supplication with frankincense and wine to your image, which I had ordered for that purpose to be brought, together with the statues of the gods, and as, moreover, they reviled Christ, none of which things, it is said, real Christians can be induced to do, I thought they might be let go. Others, being accused by a witness, admitted that they were Christians, and presently said that they had been, some three years before, some many years, and some even twenty, but were no longer. All venerated your image and the statues of the gods, and reviled Christ. But they alleged that the utmost of their fault or error was this:—They were accustomed to meet before dawn on a stated day, and addressed themselves in a certain form to Christ as to a god, binding themselves by oath not to any crime, but not to commit theft, robbery, adultery, the breaking of their word, or the refusal to restore a deposit. After this they were wont to separate, and then reassemble to take a common and harmless meal. This, however, they had ceased to do from the publication of my edict forbidding, according to your command, private assemblies. I therefore thought it the more necessary to examine into the truth by putting to the torture two female slaves, who were said to be deaconesses among them. I found, however, nothing but a perverse and immoderate superstition, and so, adjourning the inquiry, I took refuge in consulting you. For the matter seemed to me worthy of consultation, specially on account of the number of those involved in danger. For many of every age, every rank, both sexes, have been already, and will be endangered, since the contagion of this superstition has spread not only through cities but through villages and country. And it seems capable of being arrested and corrected. At all events there is proof that the almost deserted temples have begun to be frequented, and the long intermitted rites renewed, and victims for sacrifice are found ready, whereof hitherto there were very few purchasers. Hence it is easy to form an opinion what a number of persons may be reclaimed if pardon be allowed—(Pliny, Ep. x. 97, chiefly Melmoth's translation).

To which the emperor replies—

You have pursued the right course, my dear Secundus, in examining the causes of those delated to you as Christians. For no universal rule can be laid down in a certain formula. They are not to be searched after; but if brought before you and convicted, they must be punished. Yet with this condition, that whoever denies himself to be a Christian, and makes it plain in fact, that is, by supplicating our gods, though he has been in past time suspected, shall obtain pardon for his repentance. But anonymous delations must not be admitted for any accusation. This is at once the very worst precedent and unworthy of our time.

A great difficulty in tracing the progress of the Christian Faith in these three centuries is that we possess nothing like a consecutive secular or religious history of them. We only catch glimpses of what passes at intervals. Incidents are recorded which, like a flash of lightning, suddenly reveal the landscape and the actors. Such an incident is this letter of Pliny to Trajan, and his reply. We have here the governor of a province before whom Christians are brought as criminals. We find that if they acknowledge their faith and persist in professing it, he sentences them to death. But embarrassed by their numbers, and perplexed also by the fact, that save the profession of their faith, there appeared nothing criminal in their conduct, he refers the matter to the emperor. The emperor, no Nero, or Domitian, but one renowned for his justice and moderation, praises what the governor has done; pronounces that Christians as such are guilty of a capital crime, and that Pliny was right in so interpreting the existing law; that, however, it is not desirable to seek them out; that even when brought before justice they are to be released if they deny their faith, but that if they persist in it, they are to be punished with death.

Here, then, is the law—an original law of Rome before the Christian Faith begun—under which the martyrs suffered at different times, throughout every province and city, without anything which could be called a general persecution on the part of the emperor, directed to the destruction of the whole religion. This perpetual liability to punishment might be called into action anywhere in the empire for various causes. The first in time, and one of the most constant, was the enmity of the Jews; then the dislike of the heathens to Christians and their ways, which was further sharpened by local calamities or distress irritating the mind of the population, or by the jealousy of the heathen priests and worshippers at the desertion of their temples. Then, again, there was the ascription to Christian godlessness, as it was called, that is their refusal to acknowledge the Roman gods, of famines, pestilences, and whatever troubled the popular mind. To these we must add a copious harvest of private grudges, and a host of calumnies, which seem now almost grotesque, but then found wide belief. But it was the existence of such a law as this, acted on by Pliny before he referred to the emperor, and confirmed by Trajan, that gave force and effect to all these causes of persecution. And it would appear that when Christians were brought before the magistrates, as guilty of the Christian Faith, it was not in the magistrates' power to decline hearing the case, any more than any other accusation

of sacrilege or treason, for it had been determined that Christians were not a mere Jewish sect, and therefore could not in security worship one God, as the Jews did. It was a ruled point that their worship was unauthorized.

The practice of Trajan himself was in accordance with his answer to Pliny.

The very ancient and genuine acts of the martyrdom of S. Ignatius state that having struggled with difficulty through the persecution of Domitian, he had carefully governed his church of Antioch, grieving only that he had not yet reached the rank of a perfect disciple by the sacrifice of his life, for he considered that the confession which is made by martyrdom brings into closer union with the Lord. Trajan then having come to the East, full of exultation at the victories which he had gained, and considering that the subjugation of the Christians was all that was wanting to the perfect obedience of his empire, began to threaten them with the alternative of sacrifice or death. Then Ignatius fearing for his church caused himself to be brought before the emperor, and being in the presence was thus addressed by him. "Who are you, evil spirit, who are zealous to transgress our commands, besides persuading others to come to an evil end?" Ignatius replied, "No one calls the bearer of God an evil spirit, for the demons fly away from the servants of God. But if you mean that I am a trouble to these, and so call me evil to them, I admit it, for having Christ my Heavenly King, I continually dissolve their plots." Trajan said, "Who is a bearer of God?" Ignatius replied, "He who has Christ in his breast." Trajan said, "We then appear to you not to have gods in our minds, whom we use to help us against our enemies." Ignatius answered, "You in your error call gods the demons of the nations, for there is one God who made the heaven, the earth, and the sea, and all that is in them; and one Christ Jesus, the only begotten son of God, of whose friendship may I partake." Trajan said, "You mean him who was crucified under Pontius Pilate?" Ignatius answered, "Him who crucifies my sin, with its inventor, and condemns all the error and the malice of the demons under the feet of those who carry him in their heart." Trajan said, "You then carry the crucified in your heart?" Ignatius replied, "Yes; for it is written, I will dwell in them, and walk in them." Trajan gave sentence: "It is our command that Ignatius, who says that he carries the crucified one about in him, be taken in chains by soldiers to the great Rome, to become the food of wild beasts, for the pleasure of the people." The holy martyr, when he heard this sentence, cried out with joy,

“I thank Thee, O Lord, who hast thought me worthy to be honoured with perfect charity towards Thee, and to be bound in iron chains together with Thy Apostle Paul.”*

So with great eagerness and joy, through desire of his passion, having commended his church to God, he set out on that long journey, “fighting, as he says, with wild beasts all the way from Syria to Rome, over land and sea, by day and by night,” a captive under sentence of death, in the hands of soldiers, but receiving at each city a deputation from the bishop and people, who came forth to honour him as their champion. And he has but one anxiety, expressed again and again in that fervent letter to the Roman Christians, that they should not by their prayers intercept his martyrdom. “I entreat you not to be untimely kind to me. Suffer me to be the food of the beasts, since by them I may enjoy God. I am God’s grain: let me be ground by their teeth, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ:” † and then, presently, “I do not command you, as Peter and Paul,” thus giving an incidental but most powerful witness of the special relation which those Apostles bore to the Roman Church.

And it may be remarked that while he has words of honour, praise, and affection for the other five churches which he addresses, yet in speaking of Rome his heart overflows with emotion. Upon this church he pours out epithet upon epithet, as “the beloved and enlightened in the will of Him who has willed all things which are according to the charity of Jesus Christ our God,” whose people are “united to every command of His in flesh and spirit, filled undividedly with the grace of God, and thoroughly cleansed from every spot of foreign doctrine.” She is not only the Church “which presides in the fortress of Roman power,” but likewise, “worthy of God, and of all honour and blessing and praise, worthy to receive that which she wishes, chaste, bearing the name of Christ and the name of the Father, and presiding over charity.” What is the meaning of this last phrase? As she presides in the fortress of Roman power, so she presides over charity. May we thus interpret the mind of the martyr? God in His Tri-une Being is Charity; the Holy Spirit, the ineffable embrace of the Father and His Image, their Love, or Delight, or Joy, or Blessedness, or whatever human name we may dare to give to what is most divine, is charity: by charity God became man; charity is the individual Christian’s state; charity makes men one in the body of the God-man; charity is the condition of angels and men in the great kingdom to come, the God-

* *Acts of S. Ignatius.* Ruinart, p. 8-9.

† *Ad Rom. iv.*

formed kingdom. Thus charity is the distinctive mark of the Christian religion, that from which it springs, that which it is, that which it points to, and in which it will be consummated. When, then, S. Ignatius said of the Roman Church, using the same word in one sentence,* that as she presided over the country of the Romans, so she presided over charity, does he not with equal delicacy and emphasis indicate her primacy? she presides over that in which the Unity of the Church consists, in which its truth, its grace, and its holiness cohere.

The desire of the martyr was accomplished: he reached Rome on the last day of the great games and was thrown in the Colosseum before the beasts, which, according to his repeated prayers, so entirely devoured him that only the greater bones remained. These, says the contemporary account, "a priceless treasure" were carried back to Antioch. Somewhat less than three hundred years afterwards S. Chrysostome preaching on his day in his city thus speaks of him:

It was a divine benefaction to bring him back again to us, and to distribute the martyr to the cities:—Rome received his dripping blood, but you are honoured with his relics.—From that time he enriches your city, and like a perpetual treasure, drawn upon every day and never failing, gives his bounty to all. So this happy Ignatius, blessing all that come to him, sends them home full of confidence, bold resolution, and fortitude. Not, then, to-day only but every day go to him, reaping spiritual fruits from him. For, indeed, he who comes hither with faith may reap great goods. Not the bodies only, but the very coffins of the saints are full of spiritual grace. For if in the case of Eliseus this happened, and the dead man who touched his bier broke through the bonds of death, how much more now, when grace is more abundant, and the energy of the Spirit fuller?—So, I beseech you, if any one be in despondency, in sickness, in the depth of sin, in any circumstance of life, to come here with faith, and he will put off all these—(S. Chrysostom, Hom. on S. Ignatius, tom. ii. 600).

Before S. Ignatius reached that completion of his faith to which he aspired, he was cheered with the account that his sacrifice had produced its effect, and peace had been restored to his church, with the completeness of its body.†

* Ἐκκλησίᾳ—ἥτις καὶ προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίον Τρωμαίων—προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης.

† S. Ignatius in the 11th sec. of his epistle to the Smyrnæans, requests them to send a messenger to congratulate the church of Antioch, ὅτι εἰρη-νένοντι, καὶ ἀπίλαβον τὸ ἴδιον μέγαθος, καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη αὐτοῖς τὸ ἴδιον σωματεῖον. The word *σωματεῖον*, or corpusculum, indicates the completeness of a diocesan church with its bishop, the whole Church being *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* as S. Ignatius had said in sec. 1 of the same epistle, ἐν ἐνι σώματι τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ.

Now in all this—in Pliny's conduct as governor, in his reference to Trajan, in the emperor's reply, in his treatment of S. Ignatius, and in the restoration of peace afterwards—there is, we conceive, a very exact sample of what the position of Christians was in Trajan's time. His answer ruled the question of Roman law for more than two hundred years. It declared the profession of Christianity to be illicit and a capital offence; but to call this law into action, or to leave it suspended as a threat over the heads of Christians, was a matter of expedience. When the latter took place, the churches were said to be at peace; when the former, a persecution was said to rage; but at any time and place an individual might suffer; while on the other hand a persecution directed to root out the whole Christian name was not yet thought of.

And this state of things seems to continue through Hadrian's principate. In his first year, Alexander, fifth successor of S. Peter at Rome, having been imprisoned under Trajan, suffers martyrdom. It would seem as if the same hand had struck down about the same time the heads of the two great churches of Rome and Antioch, the first and the third in rank, and perhaps ordered the execution of the bishop of Antioch at Rome, with that of the Roman bishop, in order to give greater force to the example.* Many other martyrs at Rome and in the north of Italy are found at this time. It is not at all necessary to suppose the personal action of Hadrian in these. After this he was engaged during fifteen years in those splendid progresses, in which he examined personally every part of his vast empire, from its northern frontier between Carlisle and Newcastle to the Euphrates. While he was so engaged, the governors of the various provinces would apply the existing law in the cases brought before them. He would have had to interfere, and that with the whole weight of the imperial arm, if he wished to check the course of the law. We have, however, recorded the most interesting fact that when he was at Athens in the year 126, Christians for the first time approached a Roman emperor with a public defence of their doctrines, and a persecution is said to have been stopped by the apologies which Quadratus and Aristides presented to him. Perhaps the rescript to Minucius Fundanus, proconsul of the province of Asia, which Justin has preserved, was a result of this. It runs thus:—

* There is some doubt about the time of S. Ignatius's martyrdom. We suppose it to be at the end of Trajan's reign. S. Alexander I. is reckoned a martyr, and placed in the canon of the mass next after S. Ignatius.

I have received the letter written to me by your predecessor, the noble Serenius Granianus. And indeed it seems to me that that affair should not be passed by without a diligent examination, in order that Christians may not be disturbed, nor an occasion of false accusation be opened to informers. If, then, the provincials can present themselves openly with their petitions against Christians, so as to answer before the tribunal, let them do that, and not betake themselves to mere requests and outcries. It would be much more just that you should take cognizance of the matter, if any one be willing to accuse. If, then, any one denounce them, and prove that they are doing anything illegal, sentence them according to the gravity of the crime. But, by Hercules, if it be a mere false accusation, punish the informer according to its importance.

Here would seem to be a considerable modification of Trajan's rescript. The profession of Christianity is not taken by itself as a capital offence. Proof must be given that something illegal has been committed. So far it approaches to an act of toleration. It plainly discourages anonymous and malicious attacks. But on the other hand, it was not difficult to show that Christians did commit something illegal. Any real accuser bringing them before the tribunal could prove by their own testimony that they declared the gods worshipped by the Romans to be demons, while they refused to swear by the emperor's genius. Thus, favourable as this decree was to them, it fell far short of declaring their religion to be allowable.

And the same emperor who could thus write, whose curiosity made him acquainted with all the religious sects of his empire, whose temper, as an exceedingly accomplished man, having the widest experience of men and things, and ruling an empire of the most diverse races with the most various religions, led him to an eclectic indifference, and so far toleration of all, yet showed by his personal conduct at a later period of his life how he would treat the profession of the Christian Faith, if it thwarted a ruling desire. When after fifteen years of incessant travel, study, and observation, he returned to Rome, and had inclosed at Tivoli a space of eight miles in circumference, adorned with copies of the most beautiful temples in his wide dominion, he offered sacrifices and consulted the gods as to the duration of his work; but he received for answer that the gods who inhabited their images were tormented by the prayers which the widow Symphorosa and her seven sons offered daily to their God.*

* So the persecution of Diocletian is said to have arisen from Apollo declaring that the just who were upon the earth prevented him from uttering true oracles, and a like answer was received by Julian the Apostate at

If she and her children would sacrifice, they promised to grant all his demands. Upon this Hadrian ordered Symphorosa and her seven sons to be brought before him, and endeavoured by kind words to bring them to sacrifice. She replied, "It was for not consenting to what you ask that my husband Gætulius and his brother Amantius, both tribunes in your army, suffered various tortures, and, like generous champions, overcame your demons by a glorious death. If their death was shameful before men, it was honourable in the sight of the angels, and now they are crowned with immortal light. They live in heaven, and follow everywhere the King who reigns there, covered with glory by the trophies they have gained in dying for Him." Hadrian, stung by this reply, could not contain himself, but said: "Either sacrifice this instant to the immortal gods, or I will myself sacrifice you with your children to these gods whom you despise." "And how should I be so happy," said Symphorosa, "as to be worthy with my children to be sacrificed to my God?" "I tell you," said Hadrian, "I will have you sacrificed to my gods." "Your gods," replied she, "cannot receive me in sacrifice. I am not a victim for them; but if you order me to be burnt for the name of Christ my God, know that the fire which consumes me will only increase their punishment." "Choose, I tell you," said the emperor; "sacrifice or die." "You think, doubtless, to frighten me," rejoined Symphorosa, "but I desire to be at rest with my husband, whom you put to death for the name of Christ." Then the emperor ordered her to be taken before the temple of Hercules, to be struck in the face, and hung up by her hair. But finding that these torments only served to strengthen her in the faith, he had her thrown into the Anio. Her brother Eugenius, being one of the chief men at Tibur, drew her body from the water, and buried her in the suburbs of the town.

The next day Hadrian ordered the seven sons of Symphorosa to be brought before him. And, seeing that neither his threats nor his promises, nor the exhibition of the most fearful punishments, could shake their constancy, nor induce them to sacrifice to idols, he caused seven poles to be planted round the temple of Hercules, on which they were raised by pulleys. Then Crescentius, the eldest, had his throat cut;

Antioch, where the relics of S. Babylas had been translated by Gallus to Daphne, near a celebrated temple of Apollo. Here Julian, offering in vain a great number of sacrifices to the demon, was at length informed that the body of the saint condemned him to silence, and ordered the Christians to remove it.—S. Chrys., tom. ii. 560.

Julian, the second, was run through the breast; Nemesius was struck in the heart; Primitivus in the stomach; Justin in the back; Stactæus in the side; while the youngest, Eugenius, was cleft to the middle.

The day following the death of these brethren, Hadrian came to the temple and ordered their bodies to be removed, and to be cast into a deep hole. The priests and sacrificers of the temple called this spot the place of the Seven Executed. Their blood stopped the persecution, which was only re-kindled eighteen months afterwards.*

As the rescript to Minucius Fundanus did not prevent the emperor from thus acting, neither was it an obstacle to such an incident as this occurring in any part of the empire.

That it was so likewise in the principate of his successor, of all down to this period the most tranquil and the least persecuting, we have strong and clear evidence in the earliest of the extant apologies, that of Justin Martyr, presented to the emperor Antoninus Pius about the year 150. He who would breathe the atmosphere in which the early Christians lived will find it in this work of a distinguished convert from heathen philosophy, which is the more interesting as being composed at a moment when the empire seems to have reached its highest point, and the ruler of it was its most moderate spirit. We may cite a few passages bearing on the condition of Christians.

To the Emperor Titus *Ælius Adrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Cæsar*, and to his son *Verissimus the Philosopher*, and to *Lucius the Philosopher*, son of Cæsar by birth, and of Pius by adoption, the lover of learning, and to the sacred Senate, and to all the Roman people, in behalf of those out of every race of men who are unjustly hated and persecuted, I, that am one of such myself, Justin, son of *Priscus*, and grandson of *Baccheius*, natives of *Flavia Neapolis*, of Palestine, in Syria, offer this address and supplication.

Reason dictates that those who are really pious and philosophers should love and honour truth alone, declining to follow the opinions of the ancients, if they be corrupt. For right reason not only forbids us to assent to those who are unjust either in practice or in principle, but commands the lover of truth to choose that which is just in word and deed in every way, even before his own life, and with death threatening him. Now you hear yourselves called on all sides Pious, Philosophers, Guardians of Justice, and Lovers of Learning; but, whether you be such in truth, the event will show. For we have come before you, not to flatter you in this address, nor to gain your favour, but to demand of you to pass judgment according to strict and well-weighed reason, not influenced by prejudice, nor by the desire of pleasing superstitious men, nor by inconsiderate passion, nor by the long

* *Acts of S. Symphorosa*, from Dom Ruinart, pp. 23-4.

prevalence of an evil report, in giving a sentence which would turn against yourselves. For, as to us, we are fully persuaded that we can suffer no injury from any one, unless we be found guilty of some wickedness, or proved to be bad men ; and, as to you, kill us you may, but hurt us you cannot.*

We ask, then, that the actions of those who are accused before you may be examined, that he who is convicted may be punished as an evildoer, but not as a Christian. And, if any one appears to be innocent, that he may be dismissed as a Christian who has done no evil. For we do not require you to punish our accusers : they are sufficiently recompensed by their own malice, and their ignorance of what is good. Moreover, bear in mind that it is for your sakes that we thus speak, since it is in our power to deny when we are questioned. But we choose not to live by falsehood.†

And you, when you hear that we are expecting a kingdom, rashly conceive that we mean a human one, whereas we speak of that with God, as is evident even from those who are under examination by you confessing that they are Christians, whilst they know that death is the penalty of the confession. For if we expected a human kingdom, we should deny in order to obtain our expectations ; but, since our hopes are not of the present, we do not regard those who kill us, knowing that death is an inevitable debt to all.‡

We adore God only, but in all other matters joyfully serve you, confessing that you are kings and rulers, and praying that you may be found to possess, together with your royal power, a sound and discerning mind. If, however, notwithstanding that we thus pray and openly lay everything before you, you treat us with contempt, we shall receive no injury ; believing, or, rather, being convinced, that every one, if his deeds shall so deserve, shall receive the punishment of eternal fire, and that an account will be required of him in proportion to the powers which he has received from God, as Christ has declared in those words, "To whomsoever God has given much, of him shall be much required." §

Though death be the penalty to those who teach, or even who confess the name of Christ, we everywhere accept it, and teach it. And if you as enemies meet these words, you can do no more, as we have already said, than kill us, which brings no hurt to us, but to you, and to all who hate unjustly, and do not repent, the chastisement of eternal fire.||

And his concluding words are :

If now what we have said appears to be reasonable and true, honour it accordingly ; but if folly, despise it as foolish, yet pass not sentence of death against those as enemies, who have done no evil. For we tell you beforehand that you will not escape the future judgment of God, if you continue in injustice, and we shall cry, Let the will of God be done.¶

Such then is the testimony of a Christian as to the way in which the confessors of his religion were treated, and it is

* Justin. 1 Apol. 1, 2.

† Sec. 7.

‡ Sec. 11.

§ Sec. 17.

|| Sec. 45.

¶ Sec. 68, Chevallier's translation, sometimes altered.

corroborated by that of the heathen philosopher Celsus, who writes his books against Christianity about this time, and imputes the secrecy practised by Christians in their teaching and their actions to their attempts to escape the punishment of death hanging over their heads.* And again having put into the mouth of Christians the remark, that if they blaspheme or strike a statue of Jupiter or Apollo, these gods cannot defend themselves, subjoins :—

Do you not, then, see that your own demon is not merely blasphemed but expelled from every land and sea, while you, his consecrated image,† are chained, and led away to prison, and crucified ; and the demon, or as you call him, the Son of God, gives you no protection.

And in another place, comparing Christians with Jews, to whom God had made so many promises :—

See (he says) what good has He done to them and to you ? To them, instead of being lords of all the earth, not a clod of soil, or a hearth remains ;‡ while of you, if any one still wanders about in hiding, yet justice pursues him with the doom of death.

However, we know that at this time at least the bold words of Justin drew down no punishment from Antoninus, and a rescript of this emperor, dated about two years after the presentation of this first apology, has been preserved, which is more favourable to Christians than that of Hadrian. It is addressed to that province of Asia which contained so many flourishing Christian churches, and which accordingly was so bitter against them. They had written to complain of the Christians, and to accuse them as the cause of the earthquakes which had happened. The emperor replies :—

It was my belief that the gods would take care that such men as you describe should not escape. For much rather would they, if they could, punish such as will not worship them. Now these men you are annoying, and accusing their opinion as atheistical, and charging them with sundry other things which we cannot prove. Yet it would be serviceable to them to seem to meet their death for such an accusation ; and they surpass you in giving up their lives rather than comply with what you call upon them to do. But as to the earthquakes which have happened or are happening now, it is not reasonable that you should mention them, you who lose heart when

* Origen c. Cels., i. 3. Περὶ τοῦ κρύφα Χριστιανούς τὰ ἀρέσκοντα αὐτοῖς ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν εἰπών, καὶ ὅτι οὐ μάτην τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν, ἀτε διωθούμενοι τὴν ἐπηργημένην αὐτοῖς δίκην τοῦ θανάτου.

† Σὲ τὸν καθωσιαμένον ὥσπερ ἄγαλμα αὐτῷ δῆσας ἀπάγει καὶ ἀνασκολοπίζει.

—viii. 38, 39.

‡ VIII. 69 ; by this we should judge that the work of Celsus appeared not long after the punishment of the Jews by Hadrian.

they take place, comparing your conduct with theirs, who have more confidence than you towards God. And you indeed in such a time seem to have no knowledge of the gods, and neglect the temples, and know nothing of worshipping God ; whence it is that you are jealous of those who do worship him, and that you persecute them to death. Respecting such men various other rulers of provinces wrote to my divine father, and his reply was, not to trouble such men, except they should appear to be contriving something against the Roman empire. Many, too, have referred to me about such, and my reply was in agreement with my father's decision. Now, if any one has an accusation to bring against such a one as such, let the accused be released from the charge, even though he appear to be such, and let the accuser be punished.*

Here we reach the highest point of toleration which Christians received in the first 130 years. Instead of Trajan's somewhat reluctant order to punish Christians, as Christians, when once convicted ; instead of Hadrian's decision that something contrary to Roman law must be proved against them ; Antoninus, while quoting the latter, goes far beyond it, and lays down that as Christians they were blameless, and were only to be punished in case some hostility to the Roman empire could be proved in their conduct. Moreover, their accuser was to be punished. And this rescript being repeated to several places, amounted to an assurance that Christians should be left in tranquillity during the principate of Pius.

Putting ourselves into the position of a Roman emperor at this middle of the second century, let us endeavour to form a notion of what Christianity would appear to him. In the first place, he who had all the threads of Roman organization gathered in his hand, would certainly recognize it as a sect spread throughout the empire, the Jewish origin of which was known to him, and the author as one crucified by order of a Roman governor under Tiberius.† Yet he would hardly distinguish accurately the Church from the different heresies which everywhere sprang up around it, holding more or less of its doctrines and mixing them up with corruptions and abuses.‡ And it would scarcely appear to him as a power in the State, either from its numbers or the influence of the people belonging to it ; yet on the other hand it would appear as something not inconsiderable in either of these respects. Moreover, we may suppose it would come before him as a *belief*,

* Attached to Justin's first apology.

† See Trajan's remark to S. Ignatius : " You mean him that was crucified under Pontius Pilate."

‡ See the curious letter of Hadrian about the Alexandrians, in which the Christians spoken of are probably heretics.

and not as an *institution*. It had as yet no public churches.* A heathen would say of Christians at this time that they had no temples, altars, or statues;† no ceremonial worship, for he could not, as a heathen, get admittance to Christian rites, which, moreover, were carried on in private houses, and carefully concealed. The emperor would be well aware that Christians had rulers of their own;‡ it was as such that Trajan had fixed upon the bishop third in rank among Christian communities for punishment the most severe and degrading, to be thrown as food for wild beasts, for the pleasure of the people. But, nevertheless, the internal constitution of the Church would lie hid to him: the link which bound together the bishops of the various local communities, and so formed the Catholicism of the Church, would be quite invisible to all outside. Jealous as Trajan was of secret societies, so that he could hardly tolerate a guild of firemen in a provincial town, he had no suspicion of a society which had become even in his time co-terminous with his empire, and was bound together not only by the profession of one faith, but by the living links of one government. Nor, fifty years later, could Antoninus have had any such knowledge. The persecution which we have seen arose from simpler causes; the faith of Christians in one God, who had made heaven and earth, and in one Son of God, who had become Man and redeemed them, and with this, and indeed as part of this, their summary rejection, their utter intolerance of all the heathen gods; this it was that had drawn down the Roman sword upon them in answer to the popular cry, § Away with the godless! And again, their standing aloof from heathen life, their refusal to take part in heathen festivals, their withdrawal as far as possible from all public concerns: this was part of the hatred of the human race imputed to them, which made them objects of suspicion first, and then, when any special excitement arose, of persecution. These peculiarities also, and the secrecy with which their worship was necessarily conducted because it was not allowed, had led to calumnies concerning them, imputing the grossest immorality as well as cruelty.

The apologies of Quadratus, Aristides, and Justin were probably the first connected revelation of the Christian doctrines which the emperor could have; but these would be very

* They are first mentioned at Rome in the reign of Alexander Severus.

† See Origen, c. Cels. vii. 62.

‡ See Trajan's question, "Who art thou who art zealous to transgress our commands, besides persuading others to come to an evil end?"

§ Αἴπε τοὺς ἀθίστους.

far from conveying to him the character of the Church as an institution. They were intended to obviate the persecutions arising from the causes above described, to show the purity of Christian morality, the reasonableness of Christian belief, the fidelity of Christian sentiment to the imperial rule, as established by a divine providence. They were not in the least intended to lay before him the Christian Church as a whole. Thus Justin, replying to the accusation that they were expecting a kingdom, says, "You rashly conceive that we mean a human one, whereas we speak of that with God." We may then, it seems, conclude with certainty that Antoninus was only partially aware of what Christianity was. That discipline of the secret, which was itself the result of persecution—of the Christian faith having to make itself a place in a world utterly opposed to it,—became at once its protection, and the cause of further persecution; of persecution, in so far as it put Christians under general suspicion, but of protection, inasmuch as it covered with a veil that complete moral revolution to which the Christian Faith was tending from the first, and towards which it was continually advancing. Could Trajan have foreseen what was apparent under Constantine, his treatment of Christians would have had no forbearance or hesitation in it, his blows no intermission or doubtfulness. As it is, up to the time we are now considering there are no traces of a general persecution against the Christian name organized by the emperor as head of the State. There are numberless local and individual persecutions starting up in this city and in that, and arising from the fundamental contrariety of Christian belief to the existing heathen worship and the ordinary heathen life. Such we have and no more. And so a great host of martyrs in single combat won their crown. But the emperor did not set himself to destroy a unity which he did not see.

Now as to the character in Christians which their condition in these hundred and thirty years tended to produce, we can form a clear conclusion. Of the relative proportion of actual martyrs to the whole mass of believers we can indeed have no accurate notion; but it is plain that all were liable to suffering as Christians in every various degree up to that ultimate point of witnessing by death. Thus the acceptance of the Christian Faith itself involved at least the spirit of confession, if not that of martyrdom. A man lived for years, perhaps a whole generation, with the prospect of suffering, which it may be never came, or came as the crown of a long period in which heroic virtues had been called forth. Thus S. Ignatius had been more than forty years bishop of Antioch, and had carried his

church hardly through the bad times of Domitian, when he gained at last what he deemed perfect union with his Lord, by being ground under the teeth of lions, as "the pure bread of God." What is here expressed with so sublime a confidence by one actual martyr, must have made the tissue of Christian life in general. Those early disciples of the cross put in the cross their victory. The habitual danger which hung about their life must have scared away the timid, the insincere, the half-hearted. Yet alternations of peace rapidly succeeded times of suffering. Throughout these hundred and thirty years there is no long-continued even local persecution. Breathing-times of comparative tranquillity come, wherein Christians can grow, propagate, and mature for the conflict which may at any time arise. Thus while the opposition made to the infant faith is quite sufficient to have destroyed an untrue religion, born of earth or human device, to have scattered and eradicated its professors, it was precisely what would favour the real advance of a faith rooted upon a suffering God, and in which suffering with Him was made the means of union with Him.

And here we halt at the accession of Marcus Aurelius, as a middle point between the day of Pentecost and the time of Constantine.

ART. IV.—S. JEROME.

La Vie de Saint Jérôme, Prêtre, Solitaire et Docteur de l'Eglise. Par Dom. JEAN MARTIANNAY. Paris, 1706.

Saint Jérôme, la Société Chrétienne à Rome, et l'Emigration Romaine en Terre Sainte. Par M. AMÉDÉE THIERRY. Paris, Didier et Cie, 1867.

Les Voyages de S. Jérôme, sa Vie, ses Œuvres, son Influence. Par M. L'ABBÉ EUGÈNE BERNARD. Paris, Douniol, 1867.

Hieronymus, sein Leben und Wirken. Von Dr. OTTO ZÖCKLER. Gotha, Perthes, 1865.

S. Hieronymi Opera Omnia, accurante J. P. MIGNE. Parisiis.

BEWEEN the death of S. Hilary of Poictiers and that of S. Leo the Great there elapsed nearly a complete century (366-461). It was during this century that the classics of Latin Patristic Theology were given to the Church. A classical work is one in which many previous imperfect essays culminate, for the first time, in a comparatively perfect success; a work marking an era in its subject, and affording to succeeding workers a starting-point, which, though soon to be left behind, will never vanish, and which those who

advance furthest beyond it will be the most careful to acknowledge with gratitude. S. Hilary of Poictiers (366), S. Eusebius of Vercelli (371), S. Optatus of Milevis (384), S. Ambrose (397), S. Jerome (420), S. Augustine (430), S. Hilary of Arles (449), S. Vincent of Lerins (450), S. Peter Chrysologus (451), S. Prosper of Aquitaine (455), and Pope S. Leo the Great (461)—these names almost exhaust the list of the great Latin Fathers. If to them there be added Tertullian and Cyprian, who flourished long before and under different conditions, and S. Gregory the Great and Venerable Bede, who came long afterwards and in circumstances yet more dissimilar, there is hardly a great name in Latin Patrology that has been omitted. Within this circle of a century there is an inner circle, into which the greater part of its interest is crowded. S. Ambrose, S. Jerome, and S. Augustine were contemporaries; their deaths occurred within a span of thirty-three years, commencing with that of S. Ambrose in 397, and ending with that of S. Augustine in 430. It was therefore during the sixty years preceding the year 430 that the Western Church received, in its own language and in its own forms of thought, what has continued to be the text of its intellectual activity in sacred science down to the times in which we live. It is on the life, character, and labours of one of this great triumvirate that we intend to offer a few remarks in the following pages. S. Jerome, one of the Church's greatest saints and doctors, had a character and a personality so strongly marked, that it could not fail to remain a subject of interest and of debate to those who should study it, whilst the abundance of autobiographic notices he has left in his works has afforded unusual opportunities of at once gratifying interest and sustaining particular views.

In the month of August, 385, a vessel bound for the East sailed from the Port of Rome. On board was a party of priests and monks, whose destination was the Holy Land, and the head of the party was Jerome, or, to call him for once by his proper name, Eusebius Hieronymus Sophronius, who, as he was quickly borne out of the Tiber by the Channel of Trajan, was looking his last look upon Italy, and the distant horizon, beyond which was Rome. He was in the fortieth year of his age. In person he was slender and sickly; his face was naturally pale and thin; but years spent in the desert of Chalcis, at Antioch and at Constantinople, had bronzed the skin; his hair was short and smooth. A Greek tunic, simple and dark in hue, but showing no signs of neglect or dirt, was his outward garb. His face, an index to deep feelings and immense energy of mind, wasted with fasting, and bearing traces of

years of austerity, may have shown, when we now meet him on shipboard, signs of unusual emotion, for he was leaving Rome for ever, and his hand had but just laid aside the pen that had traced the celebrated letter to Asella.

He was leaving Rome as an exile, and fleeing before the face of calumny and envy. At one time of his life it had seemed as if Rome were to be his settled home. The last three years had been full of hard, earnest, and successful work, and it had seemed as if the trusted secretary of Pope Damasus were destined to build up the monument of a great reputation, theological, scriptural, and literary, near the very tombs of the Apostles. But Damasus had died some half a year before, and Jerome's present voyage to the Syrian coast was the result of his death. Yet that letter of farewell proves that there was an awakened consciousness in his heart that he had never been meant to manage the ecclesiastical administration of the central See. As well might Elias the Thesbite have become a routine high priest of the temple as Jerome an ordinary bishop, or even a pope. He was now forty; more than half of his seventy-two years were past, and he had not yet found the resting-place that Providence had decreed for him. If he had hoped to find it in Rome, the hope was now over, and his heart reproached him, if we read his letter right, that he had forgotten an old purpose, and stifled a call that had often stirred his breast.

Aquileia, the Venice of the Roman world, is not hard to find on an ancient map, near the spot where Venice herself has risen from her lagoons, since the destruction of the Western Empire. A Roman road ran north from Aquileia to Emona, and on thence to Celeia, a station on the very confines of barbarism, one of the many that were built to overawe Noricum and Pannonia, which had been difficult to conquer and were troublesome to hold. The road passed over Mount Ora, part of the chain of the Julian Alps. It was probably just at this point that was situated the town of Strido, the birthplace of S. Jerome. The modern railway from Vienna to Trieste would pass not very far from the spot. But it may be doubted whether even now there is more traffic in these regions than there was in the fourth century. The road from Aquileia, crossing the Julian Alps, and continuing on to Emona (*Laybach*) was the highway from Italy to the valley of the Save and to the Danube. At Emona the civilized merchants and farmers of north Italy, with the produce of their vines and their olives, met the wild-looking Pannonians and Dalmatians, and made bargains for the cattle, the hides, and the slaves from the regions that bordered the Ister and

the Save. Strido, S. Jerome's native place, was certainly between Aquileia and Emona, at no great distance from the latter. It was so utterly destroyed by a horde of Goths, when he was about thirty years old, that all traces of it have disappeared. To what nationality he really belonged, or what his father was, can only be conjectured, and all that even conjecture can say is, that his family seems to have been of some importance, and that he was of Dalmatian race. He tells us he was brought up a Catholic, and that his early education at home was very strictly superintended by an Orbilius, under whose charge he was placed. This is all we know about his father. He never mentions his mother, which makes it not improbable that he lost her before he knew her; otherwise it is hard to conceive that her memory would not have found a place among the thoughts of his old age. The friend of his boyhood was Bonosus, a rich neighbour's son, and, it would seem, his own foster-brother. Their union lasted past their childhood; and when Bonosus withdrew to a barren rock on the Dalmatian coast, to lead the life of a hermit, the ardent affection of his friend pursued him with regrets and remembered him with praises.

Jerome went to Rome in the year 363, being then about seventeen years old. He went there with one purpose,—namely, to complete his literary education. He studied the classics under the celebrated Donatus, and read the Greek and Roman master-pieces with his characteristic ardour. He went through the usual course of rhetoric, wearily composing the endless declamations that were then thought to be the high road to true eloquence. He studied also dialectics; but S. Jerome and logic were never destined to like each other, and he bade adieu to this branch of his studies with even greater satisfaction than to speech-making. But he made up for all dislikes by reading and devouring everything in the shape of literature. At Rome he was baptized, when about twenty years of age. At Rome too he fell into some of those sins which beset the student of that day, as they have done in other days. To use his own phrase, *he fell*, in the slippery path of youth. In imagery borrowed from the perils of Odysseus, he tells Heliodorus of the Scylla and the Charybdis that threaten the young in the Roman schools; not as if he himself had come off with his ship whole and his cargo safe; not as if he himself had not been in the breakers; but as a wrecked mariner, raising his fearful voice from the shore whereon he has been cast, to warn off all whom he may.* He left Rome soon after his

* Epp. VII., *ad Chromatium*, and XIV., *ad Heliodorum*.

baptism, and with his inseparable companion, Bonosus, who had never been away from him since the time when they were nursed in the same bosom and carried in the same arms, he journeyed home again ; then to Aquileia ; then to the Rhine ; then to Aquileia again. He cared little for his native place, which, indeed, must have afforded but little cultivated society ; he preferred the more central Aquileia. But it was when near what he calls the " semibarbarous banks of the Rhine " that he first seems to have become converted to God with a true purpose of dedicating his life and energies to His service. Treves, a fair and strong city on the Moselle, on the Gallic side of the Rhine, the imperial head-quarters during many years of this century, was his chief place of abode. Here he copied S. Hilary for Rufinus, learnt the native language, and, perhaps, talked over with Bonosus the means to carry out the resolutions he had made. It seems evident that his idea was, not merely a good life, but a life of perfection in the state of a monk or solitary. In order to carry it out, he returned to Aquileia.

On the return of the two friends to their native country, Bonosus at once renounced the world and retired into solitude. Jerome longed to follow, but, as he expressly tells us, he could not. What prevented him is not very clear, but most likely he found much to occupy him in settling the affairs of his family, particularly of his sister and his little brother. At last everything was arranged ; but meanwhile a new direction had been given to his dominant idea. Aquileia possessed a band of clergy, enthusiastic both for literature and for Christian perfection. The influence of the great Athanasius, which had so much to do with the development of that zeal for the monastic life which we notice at this period in Italy, had been profoundly felt in the northern capital. Generous young hearts were sighing for the Thebaid and the Syrian deserts, and longing to realize the life of S. Anthony. Some entered the cenobitical life, under the venerable Bishop Valerian ; others became anchorites on the barren islands of the Adriatic ; others fled into the recesses and caves of the Euganean hills or the Alps. Precisely at this point there appeared at Aquileia the Syrian Evagrius, charged with an embassy from the Syrian Church on the subject of the Meletian schism. Jerome made his acquaintance, was struck by his pictures of Syrian monasticism, as were all his Aquileian friends and fellow-enthusiasts. The result was that he and a party of his most intimate adherents set out for the East.

Passing through Thrace, " Pontus, Bithynia, Galatia, and Cappadocia," he stopped at Cæsarea to see the great S. Basil.

His journey he calls “a wandering and uncertain pilgrimage ;” in all probability he had not made up his mind where to settle, and temptations to go out of his way for utility, devotion, or curiosity, were not resisted. The order in which he visited the different countries he names can hardly have been that in which he mentions them ; he cannot have visited Pontus and then gone back to Bithynia. We may conjecture that he passed through Thrace by the “King’s road” from the *Æ*gean to Constantinople ; that he crossed the Hellespont into Bithynia ; that he thence made his way through Galatia to Pontus, and from Pontus to Cappadocia. At Cæsarea he again met Evagrius, and, accompanied by him, crossed the spurs of Mount Taurus, and so arrived at Antioch, wearied with his long and toilsome travels. (373.) At Antioch his friends, one by one, left him ; he fell grievously sick, and was still more grievously sad. But his resolution returned upon him now with new force, and he retired into the desert of Chalcis. It was destined to be the scene of his second conversion. Abandoned by his friends, far from home, weak in body, retired in a vast solitude, under the burning rays of a cloudless sky, he shunned mankind because his heart was full of bitterness. His body was covered with repulsive haircloth, and his skin was burnt to the hue of a negro. He passed his days in sighs and tears, and when he slept, his wasted body fell upon the bare earth. His abstinence was so strict that he drank nothing but cold water, and thought it luxury to cook his food even in sickness. So, living among scorpions and wild beasts, his face pale with fasting and his breast livid with blows of penance, he thought of hell-fire and struggled against temptation. It was the crisis of his life. For him, as for so many other saints since his time, the question was, victory once for all or final defeat. He describes his temptations in a well-known passage. He tells us he is not ashamed to confess his misery and wretchedness, for God’s mercy had helped him to fight and carried him safely through the struggle. It is a picture that Christians of all times since S. Jerome’s days have pondered over, a picture full of instruction, yet full of a terrible warning,—this mighty gifted man, in his hut in the fiery wilderness, in fierce combat with the very nature that made him what he was. His powers, his energies, his natural pride of intellect, in short all that marvellous composite of forces, partly of the flesh, partly of the spirit, but all of them re-acting on both the flesh and the spirit, which goes to make up one who is by eminence a man—his whole natural being was up in arms, as in some Apocalyptic battle of the Beast against the power of God.

Was unregenerate nature to run wild in him henceforth, as in some splendid Pagan, and should his end be to astonish men with his greatness in this world and leave them sadly doubting about his fate in the next? Or was Christ and His grace to be king of the whole earth of his nature, and was the greatness of his manhood to be the measure of the greatness of his sanctity? The ardour of the battle had nearly worn out the earthly tabernacle in which it was transacted. The poor wasted solitary had troubled days and feverish nights. Towards the middle of one Lent he was prostrated by an alarming fever; no wonderful occurrence, considering his mode of life and his interior troubles. He was on the very verge of death; his emaciated body, cold and stiffening, lay stretched on his pallet, and those who attended him were already making arrangements for his funeral. But he was not dead. At that instant he was passing through one of his most terrible experiences. It was a fever-dream, so like a vision that it had all the effect of the supernatural. He was before the tribunal of the Supreme Judge. From the midst of a blaze of overpowering light, he heard a voice asking him who he was? "I am a Christian," he answered. "Thou liest," said the voice, "thou art not a Christian but a Ciceronian; for where thy treasure is, there is also thy heart." It then seemed that he was scourged; but the remorse of his conscience surpassed the smart of the rods. He wept and cried for mercy, and his sobs and protestations were heard above the sound of the blows. At last they who surrounded the Judge threw themselves at His feet and implored Him to pardon the sinner's youth and to give him time to repent and amend, on condition he never read a Pagan author again. In his dream, Jerome swore the oath; he would have sworn whatever they asked, he tells us; and he called to witness the name of the Lord that if he ever again read a profane book, it would be a denial of his God. The vision disappeared, and he was on earth again. He opened his eyes to the world with the sensations of his awful trial still thrilling his frame, and the tears of repentance and of true and thorough conversion attesting the change of his heart. Much has been written and argued about this famous dream, or vision. S. Jerome himself, it is quite clear, thought that it was at least providential in a peculiar sense. He says, "It was not sleep, or a vain dream, such as those by which we are often deluded; witness the tribunal before which I lay prostrate, witness the awful sentence, which filled me with dread; may I never (again) be subjected to such a trial. My back was livid and the blows were still stinging me when I awoke; and from

that time forward I studied (read) divine things with greater ardour than I ever had read the things of earth." The whole text of the passage in the Epistle to Eustochium evidently proves that he took it as a God-sent warning not to make the profane classics the object of all his love and delight. This he had hitherto done. Even during these days of his fiery trial, he had alternated his fastings with long hours of Cicero, and his examinations of conscience and acts of contrition had been incongruously succeeded by readings from Plautus. Thenceforth, all this was changed. Not that he never opened, or read, or quoted, or taught the classics again. The dream, to him, had not signified this. But the Word of God now became his pursuit in life, his "subject"; the Word of God, which before had disgusted him for its unpolished phrase, and whose beauty his "blinded eyes could not see." What a change this was, let the Commentaries and the Vulgate tell. It was part of his "conversion" in the desert of Chalcis.

How long, during the three years that he thus spent in dire novitiate to his spiritual life, the worst of his troubles continued, we cannot tell. But they came to an end, and tranquillity was restored his soul, for he had surrendered to grace, and could say, as he did say of this very period of his life, "The perfect servant of Christ has nothing save only Christ." He had surrendered, intellect and will, flesh and spirit, taste and affection; he had completely surrendered to Christ. His cell, so long dreaded and so often shunned, as though its silent walls had been conscious of the phantoms of his imagination, became a home to him once again. He no longer rushed forth in frenzy to bury himself in some cavern in the valleys or to climb the highest hills, to save himself from his thoughts. Often, after a night spent in wrestling and tearful prayer, the Lord would make a great calm in the lake of his heart, and often as morning dawned upon his uplifted hands and his heaven-seeking eyes, it was given him to feel himself as though present in the choirs of the Angels and joining in the song of the Virgin band that follows the Lamb. "O desert," he writes to Heliodorus, now back in Aquileia, "O desert, blooming with the flowers of Christ! O wilderness, in which are found the stones of the city of the great king. O solitude, familiar haunt of God himself! Brother, brother, what dost thou among secular men, thou who art greater than all this world? How long shall the weight of a roof press upon thy head? How long dost thou hold thyself a prisoner in the smoke of cities? What dost thou fear? Poverty? But

Christ calls the poor blessed. Labour? But no one that striveth is crowned without hard work. Dost thou dread to lay thy fasting body on the bare ground? But thy Lord lieth beside thee. Does the infinite vastness of the wilderness frighten thee? Walk in spirit through the land of Paradise; with thy thoughts up in heaven, thou shalt never heed the desert." Thus he could write, from the bottom of his heart, of that desert which had witnessed his temptation. This letter was the first of that series of calls to monasticism which Jerome was soon to pour out to the Christianity of the West. It had its effect, though not in the way in which he intended. Heliodorus remained where he was, and died a bishop; perhaps he knew his own vocation. But at Aquileia the letter passed from hand to hand with admiration, and in Rome the noble ladies whose acquaintance he was afterwards to make, knew it so well that they had its principal passages by heart. It may be considered as the song of victory he sung for his own conversion.

S. Jerome now pursued his sacred studies vigorously in the desert, in the company of a select band of monks and disciples. But he was not to remain there long. The Meletian schism prevailed at Antioch, and three out of the four rival bishops canvassed his patronage. He tried to remain neutral. "Whoever is united to the See of Peter, he is mine!"* But, what was worse for his peace, the Apollinarist heresy broke out, and the neighbouring monks became furiously orthodox on the subject of the Holy Trinity. They annoyed S. Jerome so much, chiefly because his Western formulary did not seem correct in their ears, that after vainly attempting to get rid of their constant persecutions by professing and subscribing anything they demanded, he made up his mind to leave his solitude, not without many regrets, and to retire, for a time at least, to the protection of the police of the city of Antioch. There he was ordained priest, and continued to study and write. But Antioch was no pleasant place of residence. His monastic resolutions were still his fixed thought; but seeing nothing definite before him, he retraced his former journey back to Constantinople, where he listened with delight to S. Gregory Nazianzen. Thence, he accompanied S. Epiphanius and Paulinus of Antioch to Rome, where a great synod was about to be held by Pope Damasus (381).

S. Jerome was secretary of the Roman Council in which the Apollinarists were condemned. He then became secretary to Pope Damasus. It was his office to prepare and

* Ep. ad Damasum Papam xvi., al. lviii.
VOL. X.—NO. XX. [New Series.]

reduce to writing nearly all that emanated from the Roman See for the government of the Church in East and West. The holy and aged Pope leaned upon his learning and zeal with affectionate confidence. He consulted him on every point; he pressed him to write; he even copied some of his works with his own hand. The greatest of the works that Damasus urged and Jerome executed was the translation of the New Testament into Latin. The version now called the Vulgate arose out of this translation and recension, completed in 383. The solitary of Chalcis seemed settling down as the Pope's secretary; he was the foremost priest in Rome next to the Pontiff himself; it was even expected that he would be chosen one day to fill the Chair of S. Peter. His influence was wide and powerful in Rome. From the Palace of Marcella, on the Aventine, where he lodged, the sharp word of his censure, or the weighty sentence of his advice, circulated among the too easy clergy and the loose-living laity that formed the bulk of the Roman population. A group of noble ladies, interesting to all ages, looked up to him as their director and their oracle. Marcella herself, learned and serious; Albina, her mother; Asella, another Roman patrician, staid and maternal; the wealthy widow Paula, with her three daughters, Blesilla, Paulina, and Eustochium,—these are the names that meet the eye everywhere henceforth in the voluminous correspondence of S. Jerome. It was with these that he most willingly conversed and discussed Holy Scripture; it was their generous and zealous souls that refreshed him in his labours for sacred science and the Catholic faith; and it was through them that he set on foot that monastic crusade, the effects of which we shall see hereafter. But meanwhile, has he forgotten his promises to God? Or is Rome the solitude that is destined for him? He may have thought at one time that God's will called him to find his desert in the streets, amid the noise that he had once before execrated, and under the shadow of roofs that he had declared to stifle him. But events undeceived him. The tongue of calumny and the shaft of envy were soon busy about his reputation. His attacks on the dissolute manners of the clergy, his reply to Helvidius, his letter to Eustochium, his familiarity with the holy women of the Aventine, were all turned against him. As long as Pope Damasus lived, he stood by him, and Jerome held out, and the clamours of the smarting objects of his satire only drew from him some sharper satire and more crushing sarcasm. But the venerable Pope died in the early part of 385. Had S. Jerome had to think only of himself, he might have fought on, with

all natural love of controversy, against what now evidently showed itself to be a conspiracy that had sworn to ruin him and his. But his noble clients were reached by every blow that fell upon him. He resolved, therefore, six or seven months after the death of the Pope, to abandon Rome and seek a home in the East. As he thought over this resolution, the old ideas that had inspired him on the inhospitable banks of the Rhine and shaken him in the Syrian desert came upon him once more. We said at the commencement that he looked upon his Roman sojourn and the settlement he had made in a city, as a forgetfulness of his vows. "Fool that I was," he wrote to the lady Asella, as he was about to step from the quays of the Roman Port on board the vessel that awaited him, "fool that I was to try to sing the song of the Lord in a strange land! Fool, to desert Mount Sina and ask help from Egypt! I remembered not the Gospel, that he who goes out from Jerusalem falls among thieves, is stripped, is wounded, and killed. Pray that, from Babylon, I may once more regain Jerusalem, and return out of captivity to my own native land. Salute Paula and Eustochium, mine in Christ, whatever the world says. Salute the venerable Mother Albina, and my sister Marcella; also Marcellina and Felicitas; say to them, we shall stand together before Christ's judgment-seat; there will appear the secrets of each one's life. Remember me thyself, pattern of chastity and flower of virginity, and may thy prayers smooth the seas before me!" The ship left the Tiber, and was borne by the Etesian breeze southward along the coast of the Tyrrhene Sea. At Scylla, where the mainland stretches out a hand to reach the Sicilian coast, he heard, on the spot, the classical fables of the famous rock and its companion whirlpool, whilst the ship lay at anchor in the harbour of Rhegium. Then rounding into the *Æ*gean, and leaving the Malean promontory on its left, the vessel threaded the Cyclades, where every well-known name had a history for S. Jerome, bore off to Cyprus, and thence, in the track of Paul and Barnabas, carried him past Seleucia, up the then navigable Orontes, and so landed him once more at Antioch.

It is not our purpose to follow S. Jerome in the journeys that he made between the time of his landing at Antioch and his final settlement at Bethlehem. When he left Rome, he had no particular place in view as the term of his pilgrimage. He sailed for Antioch, perhaps because he had some idea of seeking out again his old haunts in the Syrian desert, or perhaps because ships went from Rome to Antioch more frequently and more safely than to Cæsarea. When at Antioch his plans

were determined, as they had been more than once before, by what seemed the interposition of Providence. Paula, the rich Roman widow, did not remain at Rome more than a few months after Jerome left it. Taking with her Eustochium, her second surviving daughter, the descendant of the Scipios, as fervent in faith as she was noble in character, followed the great Doctor across the Ionian Sea and through the Archipelago, and joined him and his company whilst yet at Antioch. The venerable Paulinus detained her there some short time; but so eager was she to reach Jerusalem, that, in spite of his representations, the party, or rather the two parties—that of Jerome and that of Paula—set out in mid-winter, the patrician matron mounted humbly upon an ass, and taking, we may conjecture, the coast-road of Coele-Syria and Phœnicia, passing Tyre and Carmel, and Cæsarea, arrived at Joppe; thence the well-kept Roman roads soon conducted them to Jerusalem. In and around Jerusalem they spent some time in the veneration of the holy places, making also a short visit to Bethlehem. Resuming their pilgrimage, they crossed Philistia and made for the Nile. They penetrated Nitria, and saw the wonders of Egyptian monasticism; they tarried at Alexandria and listened to Didymus; finally, faster than they had gone, they came back, partly by sea, to Jerusalem.

The great Doctor of the Holy Scriptures has now reached the fortieth year of his life. Since he first left his uncivilized home for the Roman schools, he had seldom rested his foot for more than two or three years at a time in any spot of Europe, Asia, or Egypt. His hair is grey now, and his name is famous; his immense powers are matured, his mind is full of learning, and his will is fixed and steadfast in the call that God has given him; and he has come to sit down beside the birthplace of his Saviour, to labour and to rest. His work on earth, such as we know it now, was only begun; but his wanderings were over, and his home he had “heard in Ephrata and found in the fields of the woodland.” Ephrath, “which is Bethlehem,” if it were not part of a story compared with which all others sink into insignificance, would be famous in the history of the Church and the Lives of the Saints, as the dwelling-place, for more than thirty years, of S. Jerome. Travellers tell us* that those who leave Jerusalem by the Jaffa gate, and travel for a mile or two almost direct south, come to a point on the hill-plain of Rephaim, near the convent of Mar Elias, which gives perhaps the most interesting view in the world. In front, to the south, is Bethlehem,

* Sepp, “Jerusalem und das heilige Land,” vol. i. p. 430.

lying along its low ridge ; its houses, like short towers with small square windows, shining white in the sun, and its white roads seaming here and there the exceptional fertility and greenness of its vegetation. Behind, to the north, is Sion and the Mount of Olives. The idyll lies before us, the epic and the tragedy are behind. S. Jerome and S. Paula, when they turned their backs upon Jerusalem, and hastened along the six miles of rising and falling road that lie between its walls and the nearest garden-fence of Bethlehem, were leaving Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre for the Stable. Even if their devotion had wished it otherwise, they had little choice in the matter. Jerusalem of that day was merely Rome or Antioch on a smaller scale. It may have had some of the distinctive features of both Greek and Roman civilization, with an infusion of Syrian wildness such as many a city of Herod or Alexander exhibited. But about its being as luxurious and sinful as any of them, there can be no doubt. Modern generations reading of it, or seeing it under the sway of the Turk, find it difficult to realize the times when Constantine and Justinian built churches there, and saints like Cyril sat in the episcopal cathedra, behind the altar of the Mosque of Omar. But at the end of this fourth century, of which we are now speaking, Jerusalem was not only under Christian laws and rulers, but was a centre of pilgrimage from the whole Christian world. Moreover, its direct communication with the important seaport of Caesarea made it the emporium of merchants as well as the shrine of pilgrims. Altogether it was no fit place for a monk, and if it had not been for Bethlehem, we may gather from S. Jerome's words, in after-years, to Paulinus,* that he would almost have regretted coming so far to find so little. His words are, as usual, an animated picture :—

If the places of the Cross and of the Resurrection did not happen to be in a great city, where there are law-courts, a garrison, women of evil life, theatres, buffoons, and everything else, just as in other great cities ; or if Jerusalem were frequented by none but monks, then, indeed, it would be a desirable place for monks to live in. But as matters stand, it is the height of folly to renounce the world, to leave one's country, to give up town-life, and to turn monk, merely to get into a greater crowd of people than you would have had at home. People crowd here from the whole earth. The city is full of every sort : men and women are so crammed together, that what you can partly avoid elsewhere, you must face out completely here.

A contemporary of S. Jerome, no other than S. Gregory of

* Ep. 58, al. 13, al. 49.

Nyssa, speaks even more strongly.* All kinds of uncleanness, theft, idolatry, magic, but especially murder for plunder, were some of the blots that disgraced the holiest place on the earth. It was undoubtedly no habitation for monks. The Holy Sepulchre had hardly been worse defiled by the heathen temple and grove that Hadrian had set up over it, than it was now by the manners of the men who professed to be servants of Him who had lain there. But few of those who crowded to Jerusalem for pleasure or for gain cared to frequent that other holy shrine which, six miles to the southward, lay concealed in the eastern slope of Bethlehem. The solitude there was almost as great as in the days when the "fair and ruddy" youth, the future king of Israel, kept his father's sheep in its plains, and sung anticipations of his psalms among its glens and rocks. Jerome and Paula, and the monks and virgins that had accompanied them from Rome, tarried not, therefore, at Jerusalem. They had passed that way once before, at their first arrival in the Holy Land. We have a description of that first visit to Bethlehem, which may stand equally well for the second, with which we are immediately concerned. It is S. Jerome himself who writes, in his Eulogy of Paula, after her death; what he says of her will easily let us see what he thought himself. He mentions that on the way she stopped, as so many pilgrims have done since, at the stone that covers the grave of Rachel. As she knelt, a short time afterwards, in the cave of the Lord's birth—that stable that had given hospitality to the Blessed Virgin—in which "the ox had known his master and the ass the crib of his Lord," she was rapt in spirit.

She protested in my own hearing, that she saw with the eyes of faith the infant wrapped in the swaddling-clothes and crying in the manger; that she beheld the Magi adoring, while the Star shone high above; that she saw the Virgin Mother, the loving foster-father, the shepherds coming in the night to see the word that was come to pass, the murdered children, the bloody Herod, and Joseph and Mary fleeing into Egypt. Weeping for joy, she exclaimed, "Hail, Bethlehem! *House of Bread*, in which was born the Bread that came down Heaven! Hail, Ephrata, *land of fruitfulness*, whose plenty is God Himself. . . . And am I, a miserable and sinful woman, thought worthy to kiss the crib in which my Lord lay a little child? To pray in the cave in which the Virgin Mother brought Him forth? Here is rest—here is my home! Here will I dwell, for the Lord hath chosen it!"

There can be little doubt that these impassioned words, and the others that have been omitted, described S. Jerome's

* See note in Thierry, tom. i. p. 243.

own feelings even more than those of S. Paula. The composition in which they occur is one in which he gives way, not without many touches of that exaggerated rhetoric which his Roman declamations had taught him, to the deepest emotions of his heart; and the passage just quoted may be read without hesitation as his own address to Bethlehem. In speaking of the death of the noble woman who had been his assistant, his comforter, his scholar, and sometimes also his teacher, he could not throw into a narrative the various events of their joint life without recalling also the enthusiastic purpose that had led both of them to forsake the world and to build themselves cells near the Crib. It is a mistake to suppose that the words given above, and others to a similar effect, are nothing more than the devout aspirations of a pious soul. They are the summing up of the spirit of an age. No such representative man and woman can be named as S. Jerome and S. Paula, of a century that began with the Edict of Milan and was about to terminate with the sacking of Rome. Faith was triumphant, but the Pagan framework of society must fall to pieces before it could be rebuilt. The men of the age were those that fled to the desert, without waiting to take anything out of the house. A S. Ambrose and a S. Basil had, it is true, stood in the disheartening fight, and an Alexandrian S. Cyril will ere long do the work that civil rulers ought to have done. Bishops must be at their posts, and must never shrink, should they even, like the Just Man of the poet, have to stand the shock of a falling world. Yet bishops, in those days, like S. Augustine and S. Martin of Tours, whilst with one hand they held up the tottering empire, with the other they built monasteries and blessed the monks. But the typical man, amid the gathering wreck and ruin of that time, the man in whom God spoke most, was he who, from his solitary watchtower on the outskirts of the strife, kept crying forth to the world, with all the majestic force of his character and his genius, that nothing could save the world but to trample upon the world. Jerome at Bethlehem is Asceticism using the tongue of the most learned, the most acute, and the most nervously-eloquent man of the age. His utterances, like all the words that God speaks to man, will have their fruit in their time. His letters and his Lives are being passed from hand to hand in every town from Rome to wherever a Roman road leads, in Germany, in Gaul, and in Spain. Their echoes will be in the Roman schools a century hence, when they will fall upon the ear of S. Benedict, and with the monks and the holy Catholic Faith they will spread over the new face of Europe, and teach the barbarians that to be conquerors they must first conquer themselves.

The holy company of men and women settled at Bethlehem as they could. At first they were straitened for room, but in the course of three years two monasteries were built, one for the monks, the other for the sisters, at some distance from each other, but not very far from the Church of the Nativity, which was then, as now, a witness of the truth of the tradition that authenticates the Cave and the Crib. These houses were built chiefly at the expense of S. Paula, and to them, in course of time, she added two others, as more holy virgins from Rome joined her sisterhood. As to S. Jerome's share in the expenses of the undertaking, he tells us it was a very small one, because he had nothing to bestow; but it is touching to hear him describe how he sent his younger brother all the way back to Pannonia to realize what he could of the family property. As he expected, the Goths or Lombards had not left much; but Paulinian made what he could out of the ruined vineyards and deserted fields, and returned with it to Bethlehem in a year or two. But Jerome's own cell of study was a cave, or grotto, close to that of the Nativity. It was one of the many that abound in the limestone rock of the hill-country of Judæa, and that serve for all sorts of uses, from a dwelling-place to a tomb. It is now entered from the Holy Cave itself; but perhaps in those days it had a separate entrance. Here he meditated, studied, wrote, dictated, taught. As an eye-witness tells us, he was never without a book; resting neither night nor day; always reading or writing.* Here, in his paradise, as he calls it, remote from men, at a distance even from the road that passed through Bethlehem, he wept for his past sins and awaited the day of judgment. Here he lived a life of the strictest abstinence and the hardest penance. Here he studied Hebrew all through the night, with Bar-Anina, his Jewish instructor, who, like another Nicodemus, dared not visit him save in the hours of darkness. Here he wrote his translations and his voluminous commentaries on nearly every part of the Old and New Testament. Here the flying fingers of his scribes took down the epistles that issued at a white heat from his brain, destined to rouse and comfort far-off friends, or to scathe contumacious opponents in Italy, Dalmatia, Gaul, or Spain. It was here, too, perhaps, or it may have been in some larger room in his convent, that he taught those little boys about whom Rufinus attacks him. His old delights, the poets and historians of Greece and Rome, were once more in his hands, and he was not afraid to use for education what he had so sternly renounced as a pursuit. He left

* Sulpitius Severus, *Dial. ii.*

his paradise sometimes, but it was to meet his community in the church, or to direct their studious labours, or to converse with Paula and Eustochium on the knottiest and deepest questions of linguistic and exegesis. As the little colony grew, its presiding genius had more and more to think of and to direct. He was master in his own cell, but when he emerged from the earth, he found himself demanded and distracted by monks, scholars, and pilgrims from all parts of the world. Bethlehem was hardly a solitude in *S. Jerome's* time, except in the true sense that those who came there, however numerous, were men whose first object was prayer and learning. To the four embattled and fortified monasteries, a pilgrim's hospice was added before long, and it seems to have been always full of visitors. Such was the life, for more than thirty years, of the Solitary of Bethlehem. It was rudely interrupted once or twice. The Huns found their way into Asia Minor, and "the wolves of the Caucasus," after plundering from the Bosphorus to the Orontes, turned back just in time to save the whole colony from getting on ship-board at Jaffa and betaking themselves to *S. Epiphanius* at Cyprus. Later, a band of desperadoes from the streets of Jerusalem, led by Pelagian heretics, came upon the monasteries by night, and in spite of a vigorous resistance from monks and lay brothers, set fire to the buildings and killed and wounded many of the inmates. The monks and sisters retreated with difficulty to the strongest of the monasteries, which held out till the Bethlehemites rallied to the fray and drove off the vagabond mob with steel and stone. Again, during the unhappy difference with John, Bishop of Jerusalem, *S. Jerome*, *S. Paula* and all who adhered to them were excommunicated, the monasteries were placed under an interdict, and the Church and Cave of the Nativity closed against them; and an order was actually obtained from Rufinus, the all-powerful Praetorian Prefect, for the exile of *S. Jerome*, an exile which, as in the case of *S. John Chrysostome* not many years later, meant a lingering death. All these annoyances from barbarians and from Christians passed over in time. Bethlehem was, on the whole, and in spite of troubles from enemies and deaths of friends, a tranquil home,—as tranquil and as happy as he had made up his mind, as a monk, to expect before the day of his Lord should come. The letter of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella, urging that high-souled, but rather fickle lady, to join them at Bethlehem, breathes sweetly of the spirit of the place; and it is needless to say that the thoughts of Paula are the thoughts of Jerome. Marcella had inspired Paula and her daughter with the desire of living and dying near the holy

places, but had shrunk from coming there herself. They boldly challenge her to that very thing to which she herself had exhorted them.

Think (the letter goes on), think of the long roll of names of bishops, of martyrs, of eloquent and holy teachers in every generation since the ascension of our Lord, who have come to Jerusalem ; not considering that they had taken virtue by the hand, not esteeming their piety or their science perfect, until they had adored Christ in those very places where first the Gospel had flashed upon the world from the gibbet. You must go to Athens to learn Greek ; for religion you must come to Jerusalem. It is true, the kingdom of God is within us ; there are holy men everywhere ; but the foremost men of all the world are gathered here. Do not think that there is no one here but ourselves ; we were the last to come. The choir of monks and virgins is the bright flower and most precious stone among all the Church's ornaments. They are here from every country. Gaul has sent her greatest sons. The Briton, cut off from the world, no sooner feels the inspiration of deep religion than he turns his back upon his western sun, and makes for those places that he only knows from rumour and from his Bible. We have Armenians, Persians, Indians, and men of Ethiopia. We have bands of pilgrims from Egypt, the mother of monks, from Pontus, from Cappadocia, from Syria, from Mesopotamia, from all the East. Hither they swarm, each of them edifying us in his particular way. Their tongue is diverse, but their piety is one. Each nation, gathered in its own choir, sings God's praises in its own tongue. We have no pride among us ; we make no boast of our life. We dress as we please, and no one wonders. We go where we list, and no one either praises or backbites. Though we fast, we are not conceited ; and if we eat, none condemn. The tooth of detraction, known in every country of the world, has not appeared among the pilgrims to Bethlehem. Luxury and voluptuousness are unknown. In Jerusalem itself the shrines of prayer are so many that they connot be visited in a summer's day. But how shall we tell you of Christ's own little city, of Mary's guest-chamber, of our Saviour's grotto ? These are our own, and our hearts would fain speak their praises ; but the crib and the weeping Infant are better praised in silence than by weak words. No broad porticos here, no gilded ceilings ; no apparelling and furniture that slaves and convicts have painfully prepared ; no palaces that a man builds with his money to enable his vile body to step on a precious pavement, and to give his eyes the privilege of looking up to his own roof-tree instead of to God's beautiful heavens. Lo ! in this little hole of the earth, the Maker of men was born.

Come out of Babylon, and let each one save his soul ; so speaks the Scripture. At Rome you have a holy Church, you have the trophies of the Apostles and the martyrs ; you have Paganism crushed at your feet, and the Christian name daily growing into greater majesty ; but you have ambition, pomp, a huge city, noise, vanity, and pride. Come to Bethlehem ; come to Christ's little city, and see our rural solitude and share our silence, that nothing but the chanted Psalm ever breaks ; where the tiller of the soil sings Alleluia as he guides his plough, where the hot reaper at his rest in the

noon-tide, and the vine-dresser busy with his curved knife among the vines, refresh themselves with verses from the songs of David. O that the time were come when some breathless messenger should announce the tidings that our Marcella had touched the shores of Palestine. We are longing to meet thee, to carry thee here, with no help from horse or carriage ; to press thy hands, to see thy face, to cling to thy dear embraces. Will the day ever be when it will be granted us to enter together the grotto of the Lord ?

This extract will serve to call up to the imagination Bethlehem as it was when the fourth century had drawn to a close. Its air of holiness and its solitude were nourishment and strength to a great soul. Independent of rich men's favour, free from the trammels of conventional society, sufficiently near great cities to have the command of books, scholars, and the voice of tradition, yet deep enough in the desert to hear nothing but the distant hum of civilization and luxury, Jerome speaks from Bethlehem with the voice of one who was living in the fervent carrying out of a deliberate and cherished purpose. As we thoughtfully look back over many eventful Christian centuries, and turn over with pondering minds the leaves of those folios which are his monument and his epitaph, we gradually grow familiar more and more with that rough cabinet which, for thirty years, was the delightful cradle of his genius. We see a man who excelled in Endurance and in Force ; a man who, with Atlantean shoulders could rise under the weight of a world, and with the arms of an intellectual Hercules could turn a river in upon Augean pollutions, and wield a club that was fatal to monster and to beast. His Endurance is shown in his work on the Holy Scriptures ; his Force, in his struggles with men.

Holy Scripture, with its manifold relations to criticism, to hermeneutics, to exegesis, and to dogma, is a whole world, a *κόσμος*, in itself. The Church has the care of the Scriptures, and the complicated system will never fail in its beauty and usefulness. But the Spirit of God, who in primeval times "adorned the heavens," and who never ceases in all times to lead men into all truth, works sweetly as well as strongly. Men are His temples, and His living instruments ; as everywhere, so in the work of the Scriptures. The voice and the writings of pontiff, of doctor, and of scholar, have concurred to hand down the sacred Word ; and in the great stream of effort, whilst we can trace a Divine unerringness, we can also mark with interest a human vicissitude. One hundred and fifty years before S. Jerome entered his "paradise" at Bethlehem, the great Egyptian mother-church had made an epoch in the work, by the publication of the Hexaplar edition of the Septuagint, restored and corrected at

the hands of Origen the Adamantine. At the very time of which we write, a copy of that enormous work lay in the Episcopal library at Cæsarea, only twenty easy miles from Jerusalem. It had served its purpose, for it had preserved the Scripture, so to speak, for 150 years, in all the heat of hostile opinions and changing fortunes. But, as the old order of the world was doomed to pass away completely, and as the kingdom of Christ was to expand rather to the setting than to the rising sun, the lamp of science that Greeks had carried so long, was to be challenged by a Latin. Jerome, twin-pioneer with S. Augustine in subjugating the magnificence of the Imperial language to the strong simplicity of Christianity, was to give the Roman Church a Latin version, to carry in her hand through the forests of Germania and round the coasts of every western sea. There had been Latin versions before ; so many, indeed, that S. Augustine says they could hardly be all reckoned up. But mistakes and wilful errors, and wide divergence made them a growing trouble and annoyance to those who preached in the churches or argued with Jew or heretic. It is the great sign of a special Providence that one man should have the power to produce a version which should, like the rod of Moses, eat up all the others ; nay, which should so utterly banish them from existence, that an old MS. of one of them would be now a treasure too great for an antiquary to hope for.* S. Jerome had already revised the Latin version of the New Testament at Rome, at the inspiration of Pope Damasus. When he had settled at Bethlehem, he took in hand the Old. The Greek of the LXX. was still his text ; as all his predecessors among Latin interpreters had taken the Alexandrian version, whether through reverence or because they knew Greek better than Hebrew, so Jerome, in his cave at Bethlehem, but with an occasional journey, perhaps, to consult Origen's text at Cæsarea (he certainly did consult it), compared and corrected Latin and Greek texts, fighting his way through the forests of uncial letters, whose every obelus, asterisk, and dagger marked a battlefield where scribe had contradicted scribe, and one critic drawn his pen through the suggestions of another. It was a five years' work ; the year 391 seems to have witnessed its completion. But when it was finished its author was apparently little satisfied with his work. He knew well that the LXX. themselves were not read by the Greek Church in one version only. Indeed, why confine himself to

* It is true, however, that partially complete copies and a great many separate passages of the old Italic Vulgate are known to scholars.

the Septuagint at all? Though a venerable translation, it was at the best a translation. It seemed clear that it was his duty to go to the source and interpret the original Hebrew. These misgivings were rudely brought to a conclusion. Some one got access to the MS. of his translation, and either destroyed or stole the whole of it, except the book of Job. All that has come down to us, therefore, of this great work is the book of Job and the Psalms, which latter he had already corrected before he left Rome. Yet it does not seem that he waited till the unknown spoiler had destroyed his labours to commence the translation from the Hebrew. On the contrary, a great part of this translation was most probably finished the very year after the completion of the former (392). When we remember that, in addition to all this, he was employed, during those first five or six years of his Bethlehemitic life, in commenting four of the epistles of S. Paul (among others the epistle to the Galatians, source, in after-days, of a celebrated question with S. Augustine), in his works on Hebrew names, places, and questions, in Saints' lives, in translations of Origen, and in his seven treatises on the Psalms, we may imagine what scenes of labour, what writing and consulting and dictating must have been going on in his grotto of study. Besides, it must not be forgotten that he read Grammatica with his scholars, and theology with Paula and Eustochium; though probably these two latter would assist him in his Biblical work. As for his beloved classics, it was more than fifteen years since Virgil or Cicero, or any Pagan author, had ever been in his hands. He apologizes, in one of his prefaces to the commentaries on Galatians, for the rude and unpolished style in which he fears he is writing; for "strident Hebrew" had completely spoilt his ear for Latin elegance. If a classical allusion ever found its way into his discourse, it came "like the shadow of an old dream." He had studied Hebrew with unwearying application. Bar-Anina's nocturnal visits must have often been prolonged till the morning light would make it dangerous to return to Jerusalem. Chaldaic, too, was found to be necessary for some of the sacred books, and Jerome learnt Chaldaic, but found it a weary task. His Jew, however, had discovered his weak point. When his pupil showed symptoms of despair over some unusual combination of outrageous construction and impossible pronunciation, he used to quote, in Hebrew, the Virgilian adage, *Labor omnia vincit improbus*; and this undeniable authority always triumphed. "What benefit I have derived from this indefatigable study," says S. Jerome, "I leave others to judge;

but I am quite aware that I have lost my Latin." The weakness of his eyes, and, indeed, of his whole body, was such that, during far the greater part of his life at Bethlehem, he could not write himself, nor industriously correct what was once written. He had to call his scribe and dictate as fast as he could what came uppermost. If he stopped to think, his notary expressed tacit disapproval, and showed by twitching his pen, frowning, and other significant gestures, that he considered his time was valuable. But, in spite of difficulties, the translation was completed, and the Latin Vulgate is at this moment the greatest glory of S. Jerome. It was one of those bold, even daring, undertakings which nothing but success seems to justify, and which, in matters relating to the great interests of God's Church, show, when they succeed, the special operation of Divine Providence. Origen himself had not dared to make a new version from the Hebrew. He had placed the Hebrew side by side with the LXX., and noted the variations. And at the end of the fourth century the Church of the East, as well as that of the West, had almost forgotten there was such a thing as the Hebrew original of the Old Testament. For Church use, for homilies, for pious quotation, for dogmatic controversy, the Greeks multiplied copies of the Septuagint, and the Latins translated it and multiplied copies of the translation. It was very generally held that the grace of the Holy Spirit had in a special manner been vouchsafed to its authors, and that it was consecrated by the living use of the Church. It was no common daring, then, for a scholar, who was neither a metropolitan with a wide conscription, nor so much as commissioned by any particular Church, to issue a version that was avowedly intended to supersede, in the West, those which had been derived from such a venerated original. A new translation from the LXX. was much, and was not without rashness, some would think; a recension of an existing translation would have been more befitting. But to abandon that great text which was, by excellence, the Holy Scripture itself, was, in the judgment of many who let their judgment be widely known, to lay impious and destructive hands upon the very Word of God. In the mouth of Rufinus, after his estrangement from his former friend, this opinion, bitterly expressed, was one of the bitterest arrows of that unscrupulous lampooner. But better men than Rufinus shared it; and S. Augustine himself, whilst in more than one place gravely expressing his doubts of S. Jerome's wisdom in making the attempt, seems never to have become quite reconciled to the new version, but to have used the old Italic Vulgate all his life.

What S. Augustine feared most was that, if S. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew began to prevail in the churches of the West, there might grow up an irreconcilable difference in using Holy Scripture between them and the great Church of the East. He did not foresee that a time was fast coming when the West would have little need to be much concerned about what the East would think, and that the only version ever defined by an Ecumenical Council as authentic and canonical was to be the very translation which he was trying to discourage. But, after all, the opposition to the new Vulgate showed signs of dying away within a century after it had been given to the world. Cassiodorus, writing in the evening of his eventful life from the midst of the religious and literary activity of his Calabrian monastery, one hundred and thirty years after S. Jerome's death (560), has left us valuable testimony of the acceptance of the Hieronymite Vulgate. From his words it appears how all that was literary in the Italy of the sixth century appreciated S. Jerome. To Cassiodorus he is the illustrious enlarger of the Latin tongue,* the benefactor who had put it in the power of Latin-speaking readers of the Bible almost to approach the very Hebrew fountain-head. As the minister who had worked hand in hand with Pope S. Agapetus in the cause of religion and letters in ruined and desolate Rome, Cassiodorus may well be accepted as speaking the sentiments of the Roman Church. That Church, however, herself spoke some few years later, and declared, by the mouth of S. Gregory the Great, that the Apostolic See attributed equal dogmatic value to the New Vulgate as to the Old.† The Council of Trent, a thousand years after S. Gregory, solemnly confirmed his words; and all that there now is to recall to an ordinary reader the existence of the innumerable Latin versions of the first four centuries is the occasional appearance of an unusual reading in the choral portions of the Roman Missal.

The Commentaries of S. Jerome on Holy Scripture are hardly less important, though perhaps less renowned, than his translations. A good translator must have many of the qualities of a good commentator; indeed, the most satisfactory comment is often an accurate and spirited translation. The holy doctor's great skill in languages, especially in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, which he knew thoroughly, made him absolutely the first among the Fathers of the Church who has

* *Linguae Latinae dilatator eximus*—a remarkable expression for the time and the country.

† Vercellone, *Sulla Autenticità della Bibbia Volgata*; Rome, 1867.

given us a valuable literal commentary on the Bible. In linguistic knowledge no one can compare with him but Origen, and Origen did not know Hebrew as well as S. Jerome. In the immensity of his acquired knowledge, and in acquaintance with every historian or exegetist that had ever written, S. Jerome had had no rivals. Whatever assistance a profound familiarity with the great pagan classics could afford in the explanation of the Word of God, he could command. But the character that most distinguishes him from every one else is the realism which he professed, and which is visible in his method. He learnt Hebrew, and from a Jew; he made the most learned Jews, from the great Jewish school of Tiberias, explain to him their own Scriptures; he studied Hebrew proper names, so to say from the life; he had visited and examined with his own eyes almost every site of interest in the Old and New Testament, and his daily life was passing on the very theatre of the central scenes of both dispensations, and amid manners, customs, scenery, and a climate that were each a series of illustrations of the Book that had occupied his thoughts. His Commentaries, like his Letters and his Lives, are alive with the life, the motion, and the colours of the Holy Land. There was something absolutely original in this. The spiritual and the allegorical senses of the Bible had prevailed wherever Alexandrian influence had been; at Antioch, the fashion had been to dogmatize and deduct, or to moralize in that fashion which S. John Chrysostome at that very period was bringing to such perfection. But S. Jerome took his stand upon the letter. It may be granted that he had not the fine genius of Clement, or the subtlety and depth of Origen. He does, indeed, often try to allegorize, and is often successful; but still it is plain, and he expresses it himself, that his mystical explanations are frequently elaborated to comply with a fashion and a demand; he had no turn for allegory, and his frequent appeals to the moral significance of Jerusalem or Babylon, of beasts, plants, cities, or human names, sometimes too nearly approach a mere play upon words to rank among the treasures of mystical theology. But it would be a mistake to insist too much upon this tendency in times like the present, when even orthodox tongues have caught from heresy and rationalism the trick of protesting against the mystical in Biblical interpretation. That there is a mystical meaning in Holy Scripture is certain; what that meaning is depends greatly on the authority or sanctity of the interpreter; and since Free Thought and Protestantism do not recognize either authority or sanctity in this sense, the former confines itself to discussing God's Word as it does Thucydides or Livy, whilst

the latter at once opposes the rival school and consults its own capabilities by using the Sacred Text as though it had been specially written to be a running commentary on its domestic virtues and its moderate enjoyment of this life. S. Jerome's views on Holy Scripture were, as might be expected, wider and grander than both these put together. He scrutinizes words and texts, he illustrates with history and archaeology, but he does not sit down on the earth with the Jew any more than he dreams into vaporous obscurities with the Gnostic. His Commentaries contain passages in which the text is made to suggest moral lessons in the most natural and eloquent language, and in his Letters nothing is so pleasing as the continual richness of scriptural allusion and imagery with which he points his teachings and adorns his own thoughts. But the Bible was to him a sacred treasure, that fools should tremble to touch and wise men could not sufficiently make their own. "You cannot enter the path of Holy Scripture," he says to the brilliant Paulinus, "without a guide and a master. I know that most men act differently. Garrulous old women, drivelling old men, windy sophists, in fact, everybody, dares to handle it, to pull it to pieces, to teach it without having learnt it. Some with solemn brow and big words talk deep things about it to silly women. Some, not unlike me, fresh from secular literature, compose pretty expositions in fine language and call this the law of God; what is the true meaning of Prophet or of Apostle they have not troubled to ascertain, but they garnish their own inanities with wrenched and distorted texts. To teach what you have never learnt is quackery; by what indignant name can you brand him who does not even know his own ignorance? My friend and my brother, listen how you should enter the path of Holy Scripture. Everything in the sacred Book is beautiful and bright even on the surface; but it is far sweeter in the marrow. You must break your nut before you eat it. 'Enlighten my eyes,' saith David, 'and I will consider the wonders Thy law.' If the great Prophet thus owns his ignorance, in what a night of darkness must we be wandering, we who are but babes and sucklings! It is not Moses alone that has the veil over his face; the Evangelists and the Apostles bear it as well. It is only he that has the Key of David who can open; to all others that which is written is fast shut. . . . I have read your book on Theodosius; happy Theodosius, to be defended by such a Christian orator! You have added lustre to his purple, and made his laws the inheritance of all generations. Go on and prosper; if you are

such in the rawness of your novice-ship, what will you be when you are a trained veteran. O that I might be allowed to guide such a mind, not to Aonian hills or to Helicon, as the poets sing, but to the heights of Sion, of Thabor, of Sina. Could I only teach thee what I have learned—could my hands deliver to thee the mysteries of the Prophets that they hold, then we might look for glorious things, such as all the learning of the Greeks has never been able to boast." The first years of his sojourn at Bethlehem saw the great Doctor of the Scriptures busy with S. Paul. Thenceforward, he continued to dictate his explanations of one book after another, until he had gone through, either in original comment or in translations from Origen, almost the whole of the Scripture. Hardly conscious of the work that he was doing, writing for his friends at Bethlehem, for Paula, for some bishop from Spain or from Egypt, urged by the scoffing of some unbeliever or by the remembrance of the days when he read *Ecclesiastes* with Blesilla upon the Aventine, he wrote on the Pentateuch, on the Sapiential Books, on the twelve Minor Prophets, on Daniel and on Jeremiah; and the work and effort of his life may be said to culminate in the magnificent exposition of Isaías. Death came upon him with quickened steps as with failing voice and ebbing strength he traced out the sorrows of Jeremias.

The Holy Scriptures were S. Jerome's vocation, as they are now his panegyric. But his cavern at Bethlehem, paradise as he chose to call it, was not one of those cells of study where a religious man can count on as many hours of quiet as the day is long. Cornelius à Lapide at Louvain, or Calmet among his literary brethren at Munster, had little to interrupt them except the summons to the routine duties of a peaceful religious life. But S. Jerome, it must be again said, was a man of Providence; and as the men whom Providence especially sends are never greater than in their resistance and their opposition, so he, like the fated tree that the thunderbolt searches out, drew storms down upon the very crib of Bethlehem. The strife between the holy Solitary and the priest Rufinus has almost passed into a proverbial instance of the mutability of human friendship. "What loving heart is secure in its loyalty," said S. Augustine, "into whose bosom shall we dare to pour our confidence,—what friend may not be one day an enemy, if we have thus to lament the separation of Jerome and Rufinus?" In the early days of the Saint's life, when he had returned from his German travels with the dawn of a purpose in his heart, but was still devoting himself to literature in the congenial society of Aquileia, Rufinus had

been one of that band who shared his confidence and his affection. When he had left him for Syria and the East, he had deeply felt the being "torn from his side." His letters and his good wishes pursued Rufinus to Egypt and the Nitrian deserts, and he spoke of him as a man of conspicuous sanctity and admirable life. Rufinus, after travelling through many regions of monasticism in company with the ardent and splendid Melania, settled at Jerusalem, where he and his patrician penitent founded monasteries upon the Mount of Olives, and became well known, he for his active power in winning souls, she for her munificent charity. In 386, when S. Jerome and his company of religious took up their abode at Bethlehem, it was probably the presence of Rufinus in the holy city that finally determined him to come to this resolution. Ten years afterwards Rufinus and Melania returned to Rome, and Jerome says of the ship that carried them, that it had a cargo of blasphemy. What had happened during those ten years? Ostensibly, it was the mighty shade of Origen that raised the storm. S. Jerome, as was to be expected, had an unbounded admiration for Origen, and in his earlier days expressed it in strong terms. But now, in his fiftieth year, he had learnt to be cautious about using that great name. Origen was claimed as a patron by a set of absurd but dangerous heretics; and, moreover, if the book that passed under the name of the Περὶ ἀρχῶν was really all his, he had said many erroneous things, even if he had afterwards retracted them. Rufinus chose to consider his friend still an ardent Origenist. S. Jerome declined to let him say so. Rufinus was hurt; visits between Mount Olivet and Bethlehem became less frequent: John of Jerusalem took the side of Rufinus; S. Epiphanius came upon the scene in bodily presence, and the redoubtable Theophilus of Alexandria, right for once, sent letters and legates to support S. Jerome. Whether Rufinus ever really cared about Origen is a question; whether he had ever really cared about Jerome is also, to say the least, doubtful. Was Bethlehem eclipsing Olivet? Was the whole quarrel on the part of Rufinus an intrigue, got up for the purpose of ruining the reputation of a rival? There is very little doubt that it was. The whole Origen question in Rufinus's mouth was a quibble. S. Jerome had praised Origen; he now blamed him; therefore, if Origen was a heretic, he was a heretic too; if Origen was not a heretic, he was a scurrilous reviler. The holy Doctor tried to show that it was right to have done both, under different respects; and the matter was seemingly made up by a solemn reconciliation between the two friends in the Church of the Resurrection. Rufinus and

Melania then departed for Rome, and Jerome's description of their ship's burthen turned out to be right.

During the course of the next three or four years, rumours began to reach the grotto at Bethlehem of certain documents that were going the round of the principal cities of Italy and Africa. When at last, with much trouble, something like a complete copy reached the monasteries, it was found that Rufinus had been turning his leisure to much account. Quietly residing at his country-house near Aquileia (for he was a rich and consequential man), he had elaborated what he called an *Apology*. It was really a carefully-prepared paper of accusations against S. Jerome, embodying every weak point, real or fancied, that long study could detect in the life and writings of the holy solitary, and sent round, with the moral carefully pointed, to be read stealthily, *but not copied*, to almost every city where S. Jerome was known. It was nothing less than a traitorous and dastardly attempt to ruin the honour and the good name of one who, by his very greatness, had many an enemy who would be glad to see it succeed. S. Jerome lost no time. Presently the two first books "against Rufinus" appeared in the patrician houses and on the book-stalls of Rome. When they reached Rufinus, he played the part of injured innocence, and wrote to Jerome, telling him that his *Apology* had been merely a private justification of himself, that he wished to avoid scandal; but that if his opponent did not stop writing, he would speak out and utterly crush him. This was partly false, for the *Apology* is nothing but accusations against S. Jerome, accompanied with bitter invective; but it was also the last thing Rufinus should have thought of. The threat roused S. Jerome thoroughly, and he wrote that third book of his invectives, in which it is hard to say which is more conspicuous, the truth and justice of his cause, the sting of his indignation, or his sincere desire for peace and reconciliation. His indignation against Rufinus was fully excusable. The plot had gone very far, and it was a question which reputation, his own or his enemy's, must fall to the dust. It was self-defence against worse than murder. Rufinus seems to have actually threatened Jerome with death; and it must be remembered that Rufinus was rich in money and powerful in influence. He had already procured from Constantinople a decree of banishment, which was only neutralized by the death of the infamous adventurer who had issued it. Rufinus had also great credit for sanctity, and his solemn exterior had imposed upon people far and wide. To say, therefore, that the man whom he attacked was not justified in using every lawful weapon against such a treacherous hypocrite, is to misread the facts of

this history. Yet S. Jerome is not so bitter and plain-spoken against Rufinus as is generally, perhaps, imagined. He is nowhere so careful, so well-guarded, so conclusive, as in this reply. There is no reason to doubt his sincerity when he says that it is for God's honour alone, and for Catholic doctrine, that he does not suffer in silence. It has been objected that he reviled his antagonist even after he had long been silent in the grave. But it must be remembered that S. Jerome thought, and rightly thought, that Rufinus's ostentatious patronage of the Origenistic errors was exceedingly dangerous; and his books had not gone down with him into the grave. It should also be noticed that the letter to Rusticus, written in 411, which contains such a satirical sketch of the priest of Aquileia, mentions him only by a nickname that S. Jerome had bestowed upon him. "Grunnius" would be recognized by those who knew of the controversy that had taken place ten years before; but those who did not would hardly know that the farcical name of a porcine hero of the comic stage meant Rufinus of Aquileia.

We must pass over the writings against John of Jerusalem and the Pelagians, as not containing anything more characteristic than usual, and say a few words about another class of opponents, whose treatment at the hands of S. Jerome has been severely blamed by Protestants, from Luther downwards. HELVIDIUS had denied the perpetual Virginity of the Mother of God, and been answered before S. Jerome left Rome. He had never seen Helvidius, and though they both lived in Rome itself, he did not know whether the heretic was black or white. He knew he was an uneducated, turbulent, and conceited man, not worth an answer; but since the pagans laughed and the Arians rejoiced at his attempts, and since the clergy of Rome desired it, S. Jerome answered him; and the answer is, to this day, classic on the point in question. JOVINIAN'S errors had also first made their appearance in the coteries of Rome. They may be all summed up in one word,—no evangelical counsels. Jerome had been nearly ten years at Bethlehem when he answered this Christian Epicurus. He refutes him with much solidity; but to the lofty mind of the great ascetic there was something so monstrous, and at the same time so grotesquely sensual, in the discovery that the height of Gospel perfection consisted in having a wife and family, and moderately enjoying this life, that he seems unable to restrain either his anger, his laughter, or his invective. VIGILANTIUS, whose turn came in 406, was an exaggerated copy of Jovinian; and S. Jerome's answer corresponds with the provocation; for there is no doubt it is the hardest and plainest

thing he has written, with the exception of a few of the passages in the epistle to Eustochium. It was dictated to his secretaries during the feverish hours of a single night. It contains comparatively little argument; it is all burning indignation or heavy-handed punishment. "Non est crudelitas, pro Deo pietas," was the writer's motto. Vigilantius was well known to him. He came from the foot of the Pyrenees, from a city that had originally been one of Pompey's convict settlements, and his father had been a tavern-keeper. He himself had lived at Bethlehem, where he had made himself ridiculous on a certain night when an earthquake shook them all out of their beds. He had already annoyed S. Jerome, who had sharply told him to hold his tongue; and now, after the schism between Bethlehem and Olivet, it would seem that Rufinus had actually taken up the poor, vain, and ignorant talker, and set him to attack what he himself knew better than to meddle with,—the ascetical teaching of S. Jerome.*

These three works, and the long and eloquent epistle to Eustochium on the praise of virginity, may be said to comprise S. Jerome's war for Asceticism. Learned, solid, vigorous, eloquent, and scornful, they let us see, with the clearness of a contemporary pamphlet, a certain phase of one of the most serious questions that the world has had to consider—Is Asceticism Gospel-perfection, or is it superstition? According to the answer to this question will be the verdict on the style and temper of S. Jerome. The Catholic Church sees in the solitary of Bethlehem a man who, after conflict with himself, arrived at eminent sanctity, and in canonizing him she has canonized the principles he fought for. To a Catholic, therefore, S. Jerome is the providential witness of apostolic tradition. He is the *coryphaeus* of a movement that was called into being by the voice of the great Athanasius. Before the visit of Athanasius to Italy, the example of Paul and of Anthony was beginning to people the solitudes with seekers of perfection. Before the exodus into Syrian and Libyan deserts, the Apostolic churches had proclaimed and practised what Macarius and Pachomius taught. The Alexandrian Church, in particular, had a roll of such names as Dionysius, Heraclas, Origen, and Clement, whose "vehemently philosophic" life carried the tradition of the Gospel counsels up to the times of S. Mark. Of all these, Jerome was the successor and heir. He had read their books, he had visited the places where they were living or were remembered, he had journeyed from church to church, and

* Thierry, ii. 48.

found every bishop reading their teachings as he himself read them. He had seen Basil at Cæsarea, a monk and the father of monks. He had seen Gregory at Constantinople, a monk and a witness, like Basil, for Greece and for Asia; he had lived with Paulinus at Antioch, and beheld with his own eyes how monasticism was understood in the first See of the East. If he corresponded, there was Augustine of Hippo to speak for the Churches of Cyprian and Tertullian; there were Christian men on the banks of the Guadalquivir, and widows and virgins in Gaul to accept and cherish his teaching. If he listened to the tales of the pilgrims that crowded his hospice at Bethlehem, or read the scrolls that they brought overland and sea, he heard of a Chromatius in north Italy; and of the spread of asceticism in the countries of his birth; of an Exuperius of Toulouse, who was astonishing the south of France and living like another Baptist on the banks of the Garonne; or of an Ambrose, well-known name, who, in the midst of imperial cares, found time to write books in praise of virginity and continence. Above all, if he looked, as he often looked, to the mother and mistress of all Churches, he saw in Rome the Marcellas, the Fabiolas, the Principias, the Salvinas, and other patrician ladies, who were carrying on what Paula had begun; he saw a Pammachius, a Paulinus, a Domnio, an Oceanus, uniting brilliancy of birth and talents to the ardent desire of perfection; and he knew that S. Damasus, whose memory he blessed, had written both prose and verse in praise of virginity, and had encouraged with Apostolic discernment what he himself had so often had to say against laxity and sensuality. He was aware, moreover, as was all the world, that Jovinian, the type of all his opponents, had been solemnly condemned at Rome by Pope Siricius and his clergy, and that when the heretic had fled to Milan in hopes of better fortune, the ever-watchful Ambrose, in council with the bishops of the province, had formally confirmed the judgment of Rome, and expelled Jovinian from the imperial city. To a Catholic, therefore, the cause of S. Jerome and of Asceticism is the cause of the Church and of the Holy Spirit. In every age, most especially at every epoch of transition, there has been some saint in whom the indwelling spirit of the Church has become vocal, and whose words are to be a light to all ages yet to come. In the working of the elements of nature it sometimes happens that a mighty force, becoming active through large tracts of the earth and sea, is first seen and felt from one mountain-range to another, and manifests itself successively and simultaneously over continents, coasts, and ocean-currents, till at last, gathering itself up, it culminates,

and bursts out, grand and terrible, in some visitation of earthquake, hurricane, or volcanic fire, that is marked in the annals of physical nature and of the science and history of man. The divine force that was to reconstruct the world that was perishing at the wane of the fourth century, was the Cross of Christ ; and the saintly genius, coruscating like tropical lightning, burning like the red-hot lava of Vesuvius, and resistless as the Indian cyclone, that was to preach it to that generation and to this, was the genius of the Solitary of Bethlehem. It is said that he was savage ; but this means that he called spiritual murder by its proper name. It is said that he was coarse ; but coarseness is a relative term. S. Francis of Sales would be coarse in a modern pulpit. One century is always coarse even to its successor ; for fastidiousness and self-consciousness are always increasing. It is objected, he has no moral system, but is only an Ascetic. What if his system is Asceticism itself ? Those external to the Church are continually complaining that they can find no complete system of Theology in the great Church-fathers.* They said it of Clement and Origen, and they say it of Jerome. They seem to expect that each great intellectual champion of God's revelation should have laboriously constructed a private house for his mental and moral man, beginning with Socratic questioning or Cartesian doubt, and working with Protestant breadth and indifference. The truth is, that the one great postulate assumed by the Fathers, from Clement of Rome to S. Bernard, is the " faith once delivered to the Saints." They knew they had foundations laid by Prophets and Apostles, and a chief Corner-stone, and a Church standing upon a Rock. Human systems, as Lammens said, are like the black tents that wandering Arabs pitch at night-fall by the base of the Great Pyramid ; they vanish with the rising sun, and the Pyramid stands majestic as before. But the Fathers are like the builders of a Gothic minster, of York or of Cologne, who keep adding, age by age, a spire or a tower, a new transept or a new choir, or carving, or sculpture, or painted glass, to the grand Church they have inherited, whilst it, though workmen come and go, has still its chant and its Sacrifice each day as on the day of its consecration. If the reader approach the Ascetical tracts of S. Jerome with the idea that he ought to find there the speculations of a carpet-philosopher who writes because writing is a pleasant exercise, or of an easy literary man, with a lofty tolerance of other literary men, or of a

* The latest German (Protestant) biographer of S. Jerome states this objection at length.—*Zöckler, Hieronymus*, 445.

conscious or unconscious genius, who is trying to set the world right out of his own head, such a reader will set down S. Jerome as a narrow, a bigoted, nay, a ferocious man. But those who know that the great Doctor of the Scriptures had what is called Divine Faith, that he thought heresy to be soul-murder, and that he used to live in a bare cave, and beat and starve himself in imitation of his Master, will expect to find him intolerant of error, and to see him put out all the strength of his exceptional powers in the effort to discredit and crush it. Knowing what the convictions and the insight of saintliness are, they will not be surprised to see him sometimes more indignant than considerate with the wretched enemies that are trying to scale the City seated on the mountain ; to see him not so much persuading them to surrender as exerting his immense strength to fling them headlong over the precipice. But Protestantism hates and fears S. Jerome because the errors of Jovinian and Vigilantius are its own practice, and because it feels their punishment in its own person. "I do not know any writer," said Luther, giving the word to future generations, "that I hate so much as Jerome, for he speaks of nothing but fasting, feasting, virginity, and so forth."* "Jerome," he says, in another place, "may be read for history ; but of faith, and real, true Religion and Doctrine, there is not a word in his writings."† With any one reckless enough to adopt such a theory as this, it would be the merest waste of time to argue. S. Jerome's memory, like the living man himself, is a touchstone of good and of evil, and often the shaft of his fiery rhetoric, like the spear of Ithuriel, makes the Enemy of mankind start up in his proper shape. Those alone can read him with pleasure and profit who read him as our fathers have read him in every age, with full sympathy for his teachings, and with instincts trained in the unchanging Catholic Faith.

The day of Jerome's sojourn at Bethlehem went down in clouds and sorrow. He was seldom free from illness and pain. From July, 405, to August, 406, he was prostrated with sickness. Just before this time he had lost S. Paula. The letter he wrote on her life is a precious memoir of those days at Bethlehem. He felt her loss keenly, and old age seemed now to be seizing him. "Fare thee well, O Paula," he concluded, "and by thy prayers assist thy client in his failing days." But still he worked. The Commentaries on Zachary were dictated in the "lucrative and furtive watches of the night." For the explanation of Daniel he read writers,

* "Table-talk" (vol. lxii. p. 462, of his works).

† Vol. lxii. p. 97.

sacred and profane, of every shade and sort. His repeated words show that malicious tongues were at this time continually busy about him. The death of Stilico (408) finds an echo in his writings. The great work on Isaias was carried through (408-9) in great difficulties, from want of secretaries, from illness, and from many interruptions. He was taking Ezechiel in hand (it was an old promise to Paula that he would explain Ezechiel), when the news of the siege and sack of Rome by Alaric (410), and of the slaughter of so many whom he knew, including Marcella and Pammachius, came like a thunderclap upon the community at Bethlehem. The terrible news, and the uncertainty left by the first announcement, were a crushing blow to S. Jerome. For whole days and nights, fluctuating between hope and despair, he could think of nothing but the death or captivity of that Rome with which his own life had been so intimately bound up. The light of the world was extinguished, the Roman Empire was a trunk without a head ; Italy and Germany, Gaul and Spain, were the prey of the barbarians. "I was silent and humbled," he says in Scriptural phrase ; "I was silent from good things, and my heart was hot ; I thought that a tale out of season was like music in mourning." He returned again to Ezechiel; but the great calamity pursued him still. "Who could believe that Rome, founded on the victories of a world, has fallen ? That she is the sepulchre of her own children ? That every shore of Asia, Egypt, and Africa is covered with slaves that once were Roman citizens ? That holy Bethlehem daily receives, as beggars, the men and women that once were Roman nobles ? Unable to assist them, I have wept with them, and as they crowded here, I have so spent myself upon them that I have forgotten Ezechiel, forgotten all study, and tried to turn Scripture words into Scriptural deeds." Yet the wretchedness of human nature showed itself under all this terrible scourging. "Shame ! shame !" he cries ; "the world is tumbling to pieces, and we are erect amid our sins ! There are Roman exiles in every land; Rome is burnt, and sacred churches are lying in ashes ; and yet we are grasping for money ! Our life is such that we may die to-morrow, and yet we build as though we had to live here for ever ! We gild our walls, our ceilings, our pillars, and all the time Christ, in the poor, is dying in want and nakedness at our very doors !" The night-hours were his only quiet time ; he could only then sing by the light of the lamp, to calm his agitated soul into meditation, and to dictate whatever he could ; for all the day was occupied with the cares of providing food and shelter for the exiles. "The West has fled to the East," he says, "and the

holy places are literally quite full of starving, half-naked, wounded wretches. It makes me weep to see power and pomp brought so low as to want food to eat, clothes to wear, and a roof for shelter." Then, as this wave of affliction subsided, the Barbarians came. Some of the nomadic Arab tribes, never completely subdued, took advantage of the troubled times and overran Palestine, Egypt, Phoenicia, and Syria. "By Christ's mercy we escaped their hands," says the aged Saint, "but it was all we could do. How could the study of Scripture go on without books, writers, silence, quiet, and leisure?" Whither he fled we are not told, but it was probably to Jerusalem or Cæsarea, in either of which he would have been safe. Meanwhile, he began to feel the infirmities of old age, as well he might, for he was past his seventieth year. "My eyes are growing dim with age, like holy Isaac's," he writes; "I cannot read Hebrew by lamp-light, nay, hardly in the full light of day. Even Greek I have to receive at second-hand from another." And all through the commentaries, letters, and epitaphs of these his latter years, his failing voice kept proclaiming that the world was dying like himself, and his darkening eyes turned away in mourning from the lamentable sight of the great Roman world-dominion breaking up in blood and flames and desolation. Yet his mind was strong and full of energy as ever. His letters alone, at this period, and the long, calm, and classical polemical tract against Pelagianism, written in the summer of 415, would well repay a detailed commentary. But his Pelagian contest was the last he was to win or wage. In 416 the monasteries of Bethlehem were set upon and almost destroyed by a Pelagian mob. S. Jerome had to flee again. Eustochium, only remaining name of all his circle of familiar friends, followed her mother to heaven. The pen that had celebrated Paula was lying now unused, or we should perhaps know that the troubles of that time were the cause of her death; we only know that her death was another blow to him. But Jerome wrote no more. Whether his books were lost or he had no amanuenses, and no money to procure or keep more, or whatever the reason was, the Commentary on Jeremias, begun before the Pelagian outrage, lies unfinished to this day. Only one other letter written, and that to S. Augustine; only one other received, and that from Pope Innocent, full of the kindness and dignity of a See that heeded not worldly ruin and rapine, but only sought the safety of the Faith, and then we get a last glimpse of the greatest man of his own century lying upon his bed at Bethlehem, weak, sunken, and deathlike, raising himself up at intervals with the help of a cord from

the roof, his well-nigh sightless eyes wandering round now and again, as if to look for the friends that had all departed and left him alone. In the seventy-second year of his age he died to earth and began to live to life, as the sun was setting on the last day of September.

ART. V.—THE RITUALISTS.

First Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Rubrics, Orders, and Directions for Regulating the Course and Conduct of Public Worship, &c., according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland, with Minutes of Evidence and Appendices. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Her Majesty. London: 1867.

ON Sunday, July 14th, 1833, the Judges of Assize being at Oxford to open their commission, according to custom attended the service of the Established Church at the church of S. Mary the Virgin, where on that day two remarkable bodies of men, whose very garb and appearance was highly characteristic of England, met together—the Judges and the Vice-Chancellor and authorities of the university. The vicar of that church, a young man, not known, even by name, beyond his university, scarcely beyond his college, had reached home the Tuesday before, returning from Sicily, where he had been travelling alone, and had been laid up dangerously ill of fever for several weeks. His nearest kindred and dearest friends had been so long without any accounts of him that they could feel sure only of one thing, viz., that something very serious had happened. This was none other than John Henry Newman, and the first thing he heard on his return was that his pulpit was to be occupied next Sunday by Mr. Keble for an assize sermon. That sermon was on “National Apostasy.” It was a mournful protest against the falling away of our nation from the faith and the Church of its ancestors. The Judge before whom it was preached, Mr. Justice Gurney, was commonly (we do not know whether truly) reputed to be consciously (what many lawyers of that day unquestionably were unconsciously) a Socinian. That he could sympathize with the feelings of the preacher was of course not to be expected. What is worth notice is, that he regarded what he had heard, not with anger or apprehension, as an attempt to kindle a dangerous flame of fanaticism, but with contemptuous pity, as the lament of the one solitary survivor

of a school totally extinct, complaining that all which he held sacred was now pronounced obsolete and ridiculous by the united voice of the whole nation. That occasion should be taken of a day of practical business to express a feeling so unpractical, he thought absurd, and expressed his feeling by turning round, as he left the church, and remarking in a tone of sarcasm, "A singularly appropriate sermon, Mr. Vice-Chancellor!"

Five-and-thirty years later, a Royal Commission, composed of statesmen, lawyers, and politicians, as well as prelates and clergy, is examining numerous witnesses, and reporting the need of strong measures to direct, control, and check the movement which began in that sermon; and any one who reads their report, and the evidence given before them, must see that (whatever measures are adopted) that movement cannot possibly be put down, and that important as its past effects have confessedly been, there is every reason to think that its future results may be still more momentous. It is seldom that a single generation sees the growth and development of events so great from beginnings so small and apparently so hopeless.

That what is now called "Ritualism" is merely one phase of the "movement of 1833," is admitted by all parties; and the leading Ritualists place at the head of the volume of "Essays on Questions of the Day"—which they published in 1867, and which may be regarded as the official report of the party—an essay by one of their most prominent men, Mr. Bennett, of Frome, describing their progress, as "Some Results of the Tractarian Movement of 1833."

The present state of things cannot be understood unless it is viewed in connection with the whole course of religious opinion and practice in England since 1833. So far Mr. Bennett is clearly right. He is mistaken, we think, in tracing it no farther back. From the accession of Elizabeth until the reign of George II., religion in England had on the whole been decaying more and more. Since that date it has been gaining and is still gaining strength. That this revival, although greatly mixed and alloyed by human errors and infirmities, has on the whole been a work of the grace of God, we are as sure as we can be of any historical fact. Mr. Bennett and those who think with him are naturally tempted to ignore or treat as unimportant what we see clearly to have been merely the earlier steps of the same movement; because the work of Wesley and Whitfield, and of the early Evangelical school in the Church of England, whatever else it was, was clearly not what they describe as "Catholic"

(using that word, as we shall see, in a sense peculiar to themselves, and which no one else would understand); and they cannot bring themselves to imagine that any religious movement which had not that character can possibly have originated in Divine Grace. From our position as bystanders, it is perfectly clear that the early Methodists and Evangelicals (as they were called),—say John Wesley and Richard Cecil, for instance,—were Catholics in the same sense with Dr. Pusey, the late Mr. Keble, Mr. Bennett, and his friends. One school and the other alike being separated from the visible communion of the one Church, and without validly administered Sacraments, both are equally without any claim to the Catholic name. The members of one and the other alike, so far as they have been sincere and earnest in holding, teaching, living upon, and suffering for any part of Christian truth, have been (more or less consciously) maintaining or reviving portions of the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church. Under such circumstances it is quite unreasonable and unreal to distinguish them from each other (as the modern Ritualists make a great point of doing) by the terms Catholic and Protestant. It is true that a Ritualist of our day holds as certain truths, many things which the Catholic Church teaches, and of which the early Methodists and Evangelicals had either never heard, or which (totally misunderstanding their nature and meaning) they would have denounced as “errors of Popery.” To suppose that merely by thus accepting many points of Catholic doctrine any man can be made a Catholic, is, in truth, the fundamental error of the Ritualists. It runs through all the huge body of books, tracts, and declarations continually published by them. On reading them, we are constantly reminded of the notion, so common among English Protestants with regard to the Jesuits, viz., that a man or woman becomes a “Jesuit” by holding certain opinions. Thus, Mr. Grantley Berkeley declares, in his autobiography, evidently without any idea of saying anything humorous, that when he married he was fully aware that the lady was a Catholic, but did not know that she was a Jesuit; and goes on gravely to observe, that the distinction between Catholics and Jesuits, though very important, is not generally known in England. Just such is the use of the words “Catholic” and “Protestant” in these writers. They are used to express members of different schools of opinion in the Established Church. We take up at random a number of the series entitled “Our Principles and our Position.” We find the author complaining of “the charge against Catholics that they are unfaithful to the Church of England,” and retaliating by

asking, "What Protestant clergyman does not totally disregard the rule of saying daily morning and evening prayers?" "No Protestant studies the Fathers." "How many Protestant clergymen can say that they have ever" [moved a sick person to make special confession of sins with a view to absolution] "in the whole course of their lives?" The same writer says, "Rationalists and Broad Churchmen are in the same relative position to one another that Catholics occupy towards Anglicans—accepting the same fundamental principles, but withheld by various causes from pressing them to their legitimate conclusions." We can hardly expect our readers to believe us, but we assure them that by "Catholics and Anglicans" in this passage the writer really means to contrast only "Ritualists" and ordinary High Churchmen. We could fill pages with quotations not less grotesque. We are inclined to think that these writers, as a point of controversial honour, and a protest against the one Church, have forced themselves to use this queer phraseology till they have ceased to be conscious of its extreme absurdity. Use seems to have become with them a second nature. It must be attended with inconvenience. For instance, they must find it necessary to interpret their language when they talk to any one out of their own *clique*, and to explain that by Catholics they mean neither the members of the Church in communion with the See of S. Peter (whom all the world calls so, and has called so for eighteen hundred years), nor yet members of the Church of England, as such (for whom the earlier writers of the Tractarian school made a great effort to vindicate the name), but merely persons who, remaining members of the Established Church, belong to a peculiar and very narrow school of opinion in it—a sense, we venture to say, utterly unlike any in which that sacred name was ever yet employed in any country or any age of the world. Persons who use familiar terms in a sense so novel should, in justice to their readers, append a glossary to their works. There might be some degree of difficulty in defining the new sense of the word Catholic. But we would suggest that a practice common among those whom our ritualistic friends call "Protestants" would be convenient. Curates, governesses, and servants are commonly described in "Low Church" advertisements as "holding the principles of the *Record*." How would it do (if we may hazard a suggestion) to define "a Catholic" as "a member of the Established Church whose views agree with those of the editor of the *Church Times*"?

For ourselves, we gladly recognize the rapid and continued

spread of the opinions and practices more or less borrowed from the Catholic Church as a real and substantial approximation on the part of many of our Protestant countrymen to the one Faith and the one Church—an approximation which, though nearer in degree, is in kind the same which we recognize not only in the Tractarian school of 1833, but also in the early "Evangelicals" and Methodists. One and all of these schools were and are alike essentially Protestant, because separated from the visible Church. Each of them held and holds distinct heresies, although some much more numerous heresies than others. But each of them sincerely believed, boldly confessed, and earnestly contended for some points of Catholic teaching and practice unpopular with the mass of Protestants in their own day, and were so far witnesses to the truth.

We should judge less favourably by far of the Ritualists if they were really nothing more than is implied in the name by which they are commonly described. The mere aping of Catholic vestments and ceremonies would indeed be a very poor thing. We well remember hearing this feeling expressed many years ago by one who is now an earnest member of the Ritualist school. It was, we think, a little before Dr. Newman left the Anglican Communion, that a clergyman who troubled himself little about doctrine, and took easily enough the charge of a large parish, was blaming severely the then leaders of the Tractarian school, because, by their strong tendency to Catholic doctrines, they had excited a degree of suspicion which made it practically hopeless to restore the ritual observances which might else have been revived quietly and without opposition. He had himself found in the vestry of his church some beautiful old vestments, the use of which, but for this, he could have introduced without difficulty. Our Ritualist friend kindled with indignation, and protested that he would be the first to denounce the restoration of the old sacrificial vestments as a mere piece of dilettanti æstheticism, apart from the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Sacrifice which they shadowed forth. Now it is undeniably in this spirit that the revival of Ritualism is now being carried out and defended. No attempt is made to "mince the matter." We mention this the rather, because what has come most prominently before newspaper readers would naturally give an opposite impression. The lawyers who have defended Mr. Mackonochie in the Court of Arches naturally felt as lawyers that their business was to obtain an acquittal for him. They therefore conceded nothing that they could help, and especially they denied as far as possible

that the use of the vestments, ceremonies, incense, &c., had any doctrinal meaning.

Mr. Mackonochie, who we believe was present, must have found it difficult to contain himself while listening to this ignominious defence. We believe, however, that the rules of our Courts refuse permission to an accused person to say anything for himself, if he is represented by counsel. But the evidence given before the Ritual Commissioners was bold and unambiguous. Mr. Bennett, of Frome, for instance, when asked by the Archbishop of Armagh, "Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest?" replied, "Yes." "In fact," rejoined the Archbishop (who apparently doubted the testimony of his own ears), "Sacerdos, a sacrificing priest?"—"Distinctly so," said Mr. Bennett. The Archbishop: "What authority have you in the Prayer Book for that?"—"That would involve a long answer. It has been so interpreted by our divines—the divines of our Church from the time of the Reformation downwards." The Archbishop: "Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice?"—"Yes, I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice." The Archbishop next went to confession and absolution. He declared that no form of absolution is "provided by the Church. There was one provided, but it was withdrawn, and the very wording was changed at the same time." (These examining prelates show clearly enough their own "views" at least.) Mr. Bennett avowed that he uses "on all occasions" the form in the "Visitation of the Sick," the words of which are, "By His authority, committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name," &c. He also avowed (answer 2652) that he "considered the Reservation of the blessed Sacrament distinctly prohibited by the English Church, though he would very much like to be allowed to make it." The Bishop of Gloucester then tried his hand. He read an extract from an essay published by Mr. Bennett.

2683. I will ask you only to say whether such is now your opinion, or whether you in any degree modify it. If you wish to modify it, pray do so. This is what you say:—

"The ancient vestments present to crowds of worshippers the fact that here, before God's altar, is something far higher, far more awful, more mysterious than aught that man can speak of—namely, the Presence of the Son of God in human flesh subsisting."

Would you wish to retain that?—Decidedly.

Mr. Bennett also avowed that he used incense, and that "the incense is the Mediation of Jesus ascending from the Altar to plead for the sins of men." That he is in the habit of using "at Mass, which in many places we now offer daily

on our Altars," the l'rayer for Unity from the Roman Missal ; not out loud, but privately. That he is aware of the opinions given against incensing persons and things by the lawyers consulted by the English Church Union, but "does not consider himself bound by the opinions of lawyers until they are judicially announced." Also that he is "aware that the Southern Convocation has expressed an opinion on the subject." Afterwards he is asked by the Dean of Ely,—

2766. Did I understand you to use this phrase—that the elevation of the elements takes place for the purpose of adoration ?—Yes. I consider the first elevation for the purpose of consecration to be perfectly distinct. After the consecration, both the elements are elevated for the purpose of the people knowing that the consecration has taken place, and that they have the opportunity of adoring and praying.

2767. Would you hold that the phrase "the adoration of the elements" was a proper orthodox phrase ?—It is the adoration, not of the elements, but of that which is hidden under them.

What follows is almost more directly in the teeth of English prejudices. He tells Lord Harrowby that his "guide in the selection of ceremonies and vestments not actually prescribed by the Prayer Book" is, "those which are in use by the Catholic Church throughout Christendom," and that this is for everything "not absolutely prohibited in the English Church;"—that he would ascertain the general use by studying the books of that Church—our own Sarum Missal, for instance ; that he believes every English clergyman ought to work up to the Sarum Missal, if he can, except upon points absolutely prohibited;" that he will not say he will never do anything more than he has yet done to conform to the Sarum Missal, although "I have nothing more in my mind now." Yet he is not satisfied that this is the type which the English Church ought to work up to. "I should like the chrism to be used, and I should like the bishops to anoint in confirmation, and to use the sign of the cross;" and "I should like a great deal more, if you ask me my likings." The only limits he mentions are, first, "As fast as he can get the people to join with him;" and next, that he would abstain from anything clearly forbidden in express terms by the English Church. He then says that, as for things not clear in the Sarum Missal (such as the colours of vestments) he would be guided by "that which I found most generally prevailing in the communion abroad." "In the Church of Rome ?—In the Church of Rome." Then Mr. Cardwell asks,—

2975-6. I believe I should rightly interpret your sentiments if I were to say that, in contending for what are called ritual observances, you are not

really contending for any external thing, but for the doctrines which lie hidden under them.—Yes.

2977. The vestments are used with a specific respect to the Divine Person of the Son of God; to advance His glory; to set forth His real Presence, and to vivify His Sacrifice upon the cross?—Yes.

2978. You do not then contend for any aesthetic purpose, but strictly for a doctrinal purpose?—Decidedly; the aesthetic purpose forms an accident afterwards, but is not the object.

2979. The object is to convey religious impressions, and to guard religious doctrine?—Yes.

2980. Are those doctrines accurately expressed in these words: the real objective Presence of our Blessed Lord; the Sacrifice offered by the Priest; and the adoration due to the Presence of our Blessed Lord?—Yes.

2981. The contest on the subject of whether the vestments and ritual observances should be retained, you regard as being a struggle between Catholicity and Protestantism?—Yes.

2982. Your opinion is that those who advocate ritual observance have in their advocacy depending upon Catholic tradition a clear and consistent ground to stand on?—Yes.

2983. That they should deny all assumed authority in the State to interfere in matters spiritual.—Yes.

2984. That the State is a power naturally antagonistic to the Church?—Yes.

2985. That the Church of England had, in the days of William III., Dutch Presbyterianism so forced upon her, that to this day she has never fully recovered from the poison then so unhappily introduced into her system?—Why should you quote words that I have written? I have not had any occasion to alter that opinion. I should explain the word "State" to be such as the State is now—consisting of all kinds of religion.

At the end Mr. Bennett is asked by a Commissioner of his own opinions—the Rev. T. W. Perry,—

3016. You were asked by Sir Joseph Napier whether, if the doctrine of the Church of England had changed, the vestments might not also change.—If the doctrine were to change, the Church would be gone.

3017. With reference to that question, do you consider that the doctrine of the Church of England has not changed since the Prayer Book of 1549 ordered the vestments?—It has been the same doctrine that it ever has been.

That is, Mr. Bennett declares to the Commissioners appointed by Her Majesty that he cares for ritual only as a means for bringing back the doctrine held in England before the Reformation; that, as regards the "Church," he considers that it now holds that doctrine, and that the State is antagonistic to the Church, and ought not to be allowed to inter-

fere in the matter. It is to all this, as well as to the particular doctrines before enumerated, that his practice and ritual is intended by him to bear witness.

One important point upon which the evidence before the Commission is very strong is that the "Ritualistic" churches are found to gain an influence over the working classes. We are not surprised at it. But it is important because, beyond all doubt, it is the first time that anything of that kind has ever been effected in the Protestant Church of England. Individual clergymen have, no doubt, often and often had influence as "kind gentlemen," and even as preachers. Still oftener, their wives and daughters have acquired a great influence. But the Established Church, as a Church, has never attained any. With the working classes the highest Churchmen have always had least influence as clergymen, even when they have been personally most popular; and when any preacher has produced a special impression, it has always been found that the persons "converted" by his preaching have before long settled down into different dissenting sects, even during his own life, and still more certainly after his death. So far as we know, the service carried on in the Ritualistic churches is the first which has ever attracted the working classes of England to a place of worship of the Establishment, apart from the purely personal influence of the preacher, an influence hindered and lessened, not promoted, by the accident of his being a clergyman of the Establishment, and therefore obliged by statute to have the service of the Common Prayer Book read before his sermon. This is in many ways a remarkable fact. It will surprise no one who knows that the principle of Ritualism is, as Mr. Bennett has already shown us, to make the service as like as possible to that of the Catholic Church. It is not a new thing that a child should for the moment be deceived by a stranger dressed up to resemble its true mother.

That this is the deliberate object of the Ritualists, and that on the whole it is very skilfully carried out, is by no means an inference merely from the evidence of Mr. Bennett. We have all heard of instances in which a Catholic priest has gone into a Ritualistic church mistaking it for that in which he was going to say Mass; and there have been some in which he discovered his mistake at the last moment when he was vested to go to the altar. Nor is this the case merely in individual churches. The publications, and especially the newspapers, of the Ritualistic school all quietly assume these as first principles, that the writers are Catholics; that unfortunately there are a vast number of Protestants in the Church of England—

nay, that a few years ago the whole people were Protestants ; that unfortunately all the bishops, except one in England and one in the Episcopal communion in Scotland, are Protestants at this moment ; and that even the Catholics, both among clergy and laity, having been brought up almost without exception Protestants, have much to learn, and can hardly do better than imitate in every possible particular the practice of the Catholic churches abroad.

We do not think that any one who reads in a fair spirit the books and papers to which we have referred will say that we have here in any degree overstated their spirit. We have marked a great number of passages in proof, but our space will not allow us to quote them.

What strikes us more, perhaps, than anything else as a total revolution in the tone of the present Ritualists, compared with that of the Tractarians of the school of Dr. Newman, is their feelings and language with regard to the Church Prayer Book. It is not, perhaps, wonderful. The Tractarians of 1833 had had their whole spiritual life moulded and formed by the use of the English Prayer Book, and King James's translation of Holy Scripture. There was hardly a word in either of them which was not connected in their minds with solemn thoughts and prayers in all the holiest, most solemn, and momentous epochs of their lives. They practically knew no other. Their gradual alienation from the tone of Protestant religionism around them was caused in the first instance by their seeing on the surface of the Church Prayer Book a system wholly different—a system of which Regeneration in Holy Baptism was the keystone, and in which indications were given as to the Eucharist, confirmation, penance, &c., to say the least utterly inconsistent with the popular religion of the day. It is quite true that there were other expressions in the same formularies utterly inconsistent with these ; the plain and unquestionable meaning of which was wholly Protestant. But these men did not yet see that the Prayer Book is in fact self-contradictory, that it did not represent the real religious convictions of any church or school, past or present, actual or possible ; that one expression was put in at one period to favour one view, and another at another period to favour the contrary. All this was first seen, perhaps, by the keen-sighted Hurrell Froude, and his genius was so much subdued by his reverence, by his sense of his own moral infirmities, and by his conviction that religious truth is attained far more by a holy life than by intellectual power, that he, strong as were the things he said, moulded his practice much more by the judgment of Mr. Keble than by his own. Above all, neither

he nor his friends had any means of estimating the argument, so well put out in a late number of the *Month*, that the real character and *animus* of the Prayer Book is proved, even where its words contain nothing objectionable, by comparing the words which it now contains with those from which they were altered. Thus the Creed used by the Church before the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, unquestionably expressed the Catholic Faith. But if any community should now erase the additions made by those Councils, and revert to the Creed as it stood before, it would at once brand itself, in the judgment of all theologians, with the taint of Arian heresy. The English Common Prayer Book when tried by this rule is as distinctly Protestant as any confession in the world. But the men of whom we speak were acquiring by slow degrees the means of thus judging it, and their veneration forbade them to draw the conclusion to which the argument led, even when they had acquired the knowledge necessary for drawing it. It will be remembered that it was only just before the commencement of the Oxford Tracts that Bishop Lloyd, then Regius Professor of Divinity, had begun to call attention to the origin of the forms in the Prayer Book, and with this view to the Roman Breviary and Missal, which were at the time totally unknown in Oxford, insomuch that, as Canon Oakeley has shown, there were no copies for sale in the shops of the university booksellers.

The consequence of all this was, that, in the earlier Oxford Tracts, the "Common Prayer Book" was always treated with a reverence hardly second to that shown towards Holy Scripture itself. That it could contain any doctrinal error, seems really never to have crossed the writers' minds, even as a possibility. But, apart from that, its very words and expressions were to be defended to the death, and venerated as things too sacred for discussion. How totally opposite has been the education of the present generation of Ritualists we need hardly say. All their lives they have thought of the forms of the Prayer Book as imposed upon them by the State, and as the main obstacle between themselves and a thoroughly Catholic Liturgy, such as they admit to be enjoyed by their "more fortunate Roman brethren." The consequence is that their feelings towards the Church Prayer Book and its formularies is that of persons asking, What is the least respect which I can honestly pay it consistently with my duty? not, How can I duly reverence it? And what they feel to be thus required by duty is not much. Thus one of the most thoughtful writers in "The Church and the World," and one who is quite unable to think of ever leaving the Church of

England as a possible course, tells us : "If it can be distinctly proved that anything in the English formularies is contrary to [the doctrines of the Universal Church], we say, and without any doubt of our position, that the English formularies are wrong." And this is, as a matter of fact, the conclusion to which most of them have come. The writers in the Church newspapers express the matter even more plainly. For instance, the following extracts are from an article in the *Church Times* of March 7, 1868 :—

There are few of us that have not in years gone by written panegyrics upon the Prayer Book at which we should now smile, and recall, not without sadness, the innocent simplicity of our youth by which alone such panegyrics could have been dictated. Then the Prayer Book seemed in our eyes to be a work of almost miraculous excellence ; but the proof of a service book is in the using of it ; and those who have really subjected ours to this test will agree that, apart from its literary merits, which are unapproachable, the miracle is rather how those to whom the task of compiling it was entrusted, could have discharged their function so ill. Given the material which Cranmer had at his disposal, it is a perfect marvel that he should have turned out a work so clumsy, so inartificial, so hard, so jejune, so monotonous. Given the Breviary with orders to reduce the daily services to a fourth of their length, and anybody might have drawn out as good a scheme in ten minutes. The result of Cranmer's haste and bungling has been a disastrous failure, whatever be the criterion by which it may be judged. The daily office was probably as much used in the middle ages as our morning and evening services are now ; and the net result of the change has been to lose us Scotland, Ireland, Wales, the masses in our large towns, America, and all our Colonies. Of course, it was easy enough to reel off any amount of fine talk or fine writing about "our truly admirable Liturgy," when it was practically disused, and when the religion of Churchmen was a mere theory ; but the real value of the said "Liturgy" as a manual of popular devotion, is shown by the flood of works by which those who used it in earnest have always found it necessary to supplement its deficiencies.

A favourite subject for declamation used to be the manner in which the Prayer Book provided for the wants of the Christian from his cradle to his grave. It certainly does provide that he shall be baptized, catechised, confirmed, married, visited in sickness, and buried ; but nothing can be conceived more unhappy than the way in which this is done. Absolutely, no allowance is made for differences of character, age, position, or circumstances. Christian men appear to be looked upon as a sort of cast-iron commodity, all turned out of the same mould ; and there are admirers of Cranmer who seem to glory in what is really our shame. For example, Bishop Coxe actually thinks there is something sublime in the fact that we have but one Burial Service ! which, we may remark, is the principle of Uniformity run mad.

Our list of occasional prayers is almost insulting from its poverty.

As to a proposed change in the Scripture lessons, the same article says :—

There is a preliminary question to be settled—Ought the daily service to be regarded as a spiritual exercise for the priest or for the people? In the latter capacity, as we have already said, it has signally failed, and it always will fail, tinker the *Lectionary* as you may.

If we pleased, we could fill, not one article, but a whole number, with passages more or less in the same tone. It is hard for one who remembers the writings of the early Tractarians to realize the fact that this is from the editorial article of an extreme Church paper, edited by a leading London clergyman.

There is another note of difference which we own we see with less pleasure, because it can hardly fail to indicate a lowered moral and religious tone. The contrast is, perhaps, even more complete between the feelings with which the modern school and the Tractarians of thirty years ago regarded the Protestant bishops. It is probable that the extreme veneration of a Puseyite of 1833 towards a bishop was partly impressed upon the whole school by the personal character of Dr. Newman. All the world remembers some passages in the *Apologia* descriptive of his feelings on this subject. “What to me was *jure divino* was the voice of my bishop in his own person. My own bishop was my Pope—I knew no other—the successor of the Apostles, the Vicar of Christ. This continued through my course; and when at length, in 1845, I wrote to Bishop Wiseman, in whose vicariate I found myself, to announce my conversion, I could find nothing better to say to him than that I would obey the Pope as I had obeyed my own bishop in the Anglican Church. My duty to him was my point of honour; his disapprobation was the one thing I could not bear.” Those who best knew him while in the Church of England well remember how absolutely all this was matter, not of words, but of acts and of the heart. A modern Ritualist, on the contrary, seems to us to regard his bishop merely as “a man who has been lucky in his profession” (to adopt a well-known phrase of S. G. O), who by the Act of the Church has the power of conferring orders, and as an instrument of the State is invested with certain legal powers. No doubt it is difficult to see how else the modern Protestant bishop was to be regarded by men who openly declare Protestantism to be a heresy, or rather a vast congeries of heresies. How would real Catholics feel towards a bishop who should publish an unequivocal, earnest denial of the grace of Baptism, or of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and should impose heavy ecclesiastical penalties upon a Priest under his jurisdiction, openly and avowedly for teaching that our Divine Lord in the Eucharist ought to be worshipped? It is easy to say that such a case is

impossible. In the present day, thank God, it is so. But three hundred years ago an Archbishop of Cologne and a Cardinal Bishop of Beauvais actually fell into some such heresies. It is not, therefore, inconceivable. Of course the answer is, that should any bishop fall so foully, his flock would withdraw their obedience from him, and turn their eyes to the Rock of S. Peter, and to the Rock of S. Peter they would not look in vain. Anglicans, unhappily, have been taught that under such circumstances they should appeal, not to the See of S. Peter, but to the Primitive Church, as its records stand in history, and to a future general council. Of course the practical result of this is that an Anglican has only to judge his bishop a heretic in order to convince himself that he owes obedience no longer to him, but to some imaginary future general council, and meanwhile to the Primitive Church—that is, to his own opinion of its judgment—that is, to himself. And thus obedience to ecclesiastical superiors really is, on his theory, a duty only as long as he agrees with them; and when he ceases to agree with them, his allegiance is transferred to himself. Hence to blame an Anglican who sincerely believes that to reject the Real Presence and of the Adoration of our Blessed Lord in the Eucharist is heresy, because he refuses to yield to his bishop any more obedience than the law compels him to yield, is, in truth, to condemn him for being an Anglican, and yet maintaining the necessity of any dogma. And this is in truth to be condemned, for it is a flagrant inconsistency. What can be more inconsistent than to deny that any authority actually exists which can require belief; and yet to lay down certain doctrine to which it is heresy not to give an interior assent? But the inconsistency is at least a happy one when it leads a man to receive, with all his heart, truths which God has revealed.

Under these circumstances, men whose natural character and habitual conduct tends rather to the extreme of reverence towards authority, will say with John Keble,—

“ In our position—I mean in the position of English Churchmen—it seems to be of the very last importance that we should keep in our minds, and before all Christendom, the fact that we stand as orthodox Catholics upon a constant virtual appeal to the *Œcumical* voice of the Church, expressed by the four great councils, and by general consent in all the ages during which she was undivided. And if that voice be disputed, is there any conceivable way of bringing the dispute to an issue, except only another true *Œcumical* Council, when such, by God’s grace, may be had. . . . ”

“ Many a devout and loving heart, I well know, will rise up

against this view of our case. To be on this conditional temporary footing will strike them as something so unsatisfactory, so miserably poor and meagre, so unlike the glorious vision which they have been used to gaze on of the one Catholic Apostolic Church. And poor indeed and disappointing it undoubtedly is; but not otherwise than as the aspect of Christianity itself in the world is poor and disappointing compared with what we read of it in the Gospel."—(Keble on "Eucharistical Adoration.")

The work from which this passage is extracted was written by Mr. Keble in consequence of the proceedings against Archdeacon Denison in 1856. The Archdeacon was accused of teaching that our Lord was to be adored in the Eucharist.

The case was heard before the Archbishop of Canterbury in person, who decided that his doctrine was contrary to the thirty-nine Articles, and on that ground sentenced him to be deprived of his preferments. The Archdeacon appealed from the Archbishop in person to Sir H. Jenner Fust, a layman representing the Archbishop in the Court of Arches. This strange proceeding is in accordance with a modern Act of Parliament (the Clergy Discipline Act). There the sentence was confirmed. The Archdeacon then appealed to the Court of Privy Council, which refused to hear the case on its merits, deciding that the sentence was void from an informality in the proceedings. The case then fell to the ground; but Archbishop Sumner's judgment still remains, the last judicial declaration of any Church of England authority upon the subject.

It may be worth while to call attention here to two circumstances. First, that during the whole course of the Gorham case, the party opposed to Mr. Gorham had protested against the carrying of a sacred question of doctrine touching the nature of a sacrament from the Court of Arches, which formally represented the Archbishop, to the Committee of Privy Council. Six years later, Archdeacon Denison, with the full concurrence of the chief men of the same party, appealed from the sentence of the Archbishop in person, confirmed by the Court of Arches, to the same Committee of Privy Council; and it is only by the sentence of that Committee setting aside that of the Archbishop, that Archdeacon Denison at this moment holds his position in the Church of England.

Next, on the 20th of March, 1850, a well-known protest against the Gorham judgment was published, which declared that any Church which should make an open question of any article of the faith would cease, by that act, to belong to the Catholic Church. This principle was applied specially to the

Gorham judgment, which decided that members of the Established Church were equally free to hold or deny the grace of Baptism. This protest was signed and published as his own by Archdeacon Denison.

In 1856, Archdeacon Denison expressly pleaded that the doctrine of the Eucharist, which he maintained to be the doctrine of the Catholic Church, was an open question in the Church of England. This was all that he maintained. Not that his doctrine could be enforced upon any one, but that he was at liberty to hold it. We observe that Mr. Keble pleads the same in a pamphlet published in 1858. His words are: "The Bishop of Brechin, and those who may agree with him (I may venture to say) wish it to be remembered all along that they are seeking only toleration for their worship and teaching; not to enforce it as a condition of communion on others, much less as necessary to salvation."

This pamphlet, "Considerations suggested by a late Pastoral Letter," contained comments by Mr. Keble upon a letter in which all the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Communion in Scotland (except Bishop Forbes) solemnly condemned his teaching upon the subject of the Holy Eucharist. It shows how a man, meek and submissive to a proverb, regarded his own position with relation to the bishops of his communion.

Mr. Bennett was examined on the same subject before the Ritual Commissioners. He said that his own conduct proved that he did not think it necessary to consult the bishops on questions of ritual; and although, "on trivial or immaterial things, you would naturally follow the bishop's advice, if they were important things, such as vestments, the bishop would have no authority." In cases in which there was an appeal to the bishop, and from him to the archbishop, Mr. Bennett considered that there is a farther appeal "to the Church in Synod assembled, in which the whole Church might speak, and not one individual." When asked whether, in England, that Synod would be Convocation, he made this astonishing answer: "The Synod is an aggregate body of the Church called together, and by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost deciding points. Convocation is not a sacred Synod; it is a Parliament." Sir R. J. Phillimore: "Do you mean a Synod in England?"—"A Synod in England, a national Synod." "As distinct from Convocation?"—"Yes." "If the national Synod came to a decision, you would feel bound by that?"—"I should feel myself bound by that."

If this had any definite meaning, it must mean that Mr. Bennett would consider the decrees of such a "national

Synod" in such sense made "by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost," that he would feel bound to yield them internal assent, even upon the most sacred subjects, against his own private judgment; in a word, that he would regard them as infallible. As he cannot really have meant that, we presume he got puzzled under examination, and said what he did not deliberately intend.

Mr. Nugée, rector of Widley and Wymering, in the diocese of Winchester, was examined on this point, and seems much of the same opinion. He tells us also that some of his parishioners sent a memorial to the Bishop, who wrote to ask him "What does it all mean?—will you tell me?"

I wrote back simply stating, that of course, as my spiritual father, I was bound to listen to his monition, which I was prepared to do. I said if he would kindly write to me in a letter as to anything which I did which was abnormal or illegal in the Church, I would tell his lordship exactly what I should do. I said I should send it to Sir Robert Phillimore, and abide by his decision. I have never had a word with the Bishop of Winchester since then. He has been to visit my parish. He has consecrated a cemetery, and visited the sisterhood. He gave them his benediction in the most fatherly manner, and expressed himself delighted with the working of the institution.

A different tone from that of Dr. Newman is discernible here. It is pleasant to see that the Bishop was so well satisfied with it. It may be doubted whether Mr. Nugée would have got off so easily had he adopted the tone of that founder of his school. "There are those," as Dr. Newman remarked when looking back from the promised land upon the time of his captivity, "There are those who, reversing the Roman's maxim, '*Parcere subjectis et debellare superbos*,' are wont to shrink from the contumacious, and to be valiant towards the submissive."

But the tone of the present followers of the Tractarian school towards their bishops may be best illustrated from the newspapers which represent them. The following remarks on the last debate in the Upper House of Convocation are extracted from the leading articles of a weekly paper said, and we believe avowed, to be edited by a rev. gentleman who lately subscribed his name to a Ritualist manifesto as a "Priest of the Diocese of London":—

There are occasions when the bishops can be active enough. They had hardly met last week before they fell to devising a scheme for torturing the unhappy Ritualists. The author of the project, we regret to learn, was the Archbishop himself; and his Grace's object was only too apparent. His Royal Commission had not only failed to secure the confidence of the public,

but had called forth a shout of derision from one end of the country to the other ; and it is plain that the most rev. prelate must have thought that it might be possible to rehabilitate it by a vote of Convocation. The enterprise, however, has not proved happy.

We note with sorrow the phenomenon ; but when it is a question of vindicating the truth of Revelation the bishops are obstinately obstructive : when it is a question of persecuting, harassing, and hindering those who are doing their best for Christ and His Church, they develop a most unholy activity. No wonder that there are secessions, but it is surprising that the Bishop of London should point to those secessions as a reason why the bishops should have more power. Surely he must be aware that the emissaries of Rome are pressing with unwearied assiduity his own avowal that he is in communion with Dr. Colenso as a palmary argument against the Church of England. And no wonder that people should desire to leave a ship where the officers daily show their ignorance and incompetency (the debate in the Upper House was a miserable specimen of both), and where if a spar goes overboard in consequence of the unseamanlike manner in which the vessel is navigated, there goes up a cry that the only men who appear to know their business and to be doing their duty shall be clapped in irons !

When the Bishop of Ely speaks of certain doctrines being untenable in the Church of England, all he means is that they are not in "Browne on the Thirty-nine Articles," a proposition which no theologian of any learning or character would regard as identical. More startling is the language of the Bishop of London. Speaking of certain usages which he disapproves, and which have been maintained, in one form or another, by the Eastern and Western Churches for fifteen hundred years, he declared that the bishops would be traitors to the Church if they allowed the foundations of the faith to be sapped in such a way. The foundations of the faith are the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. What then is that bishop to be called who strives with all his might to protect one who has denied two main articles of the Creed, who jeers at the very idea of Inspiration, who has taken care to explain that the Sacraments are bare signs ? What is he to be called who abets Mr. Bristow Wilson, who champions Bishop Colenso, who promotes Mr. Rogers of Bishopsgate, who compendiously "hangs all theology" ? If the Bishop of London had a spark of loyalty or humility, he would have said, in speaking of some late secessions, "It was my fault. My Erastianism, my collusion with heresy, my weak subervience to a clique of plausible unbelievers, have made some earnest though erring, clergymen despair of a Church which possesses such a prelate." The question is not in the least whether the seceders are right in their opinion, but whether their opinion be as we have expressed it. And, as a matter of plain fact, two-thirds of all the secessions which have taken place for the last few years, are due to the attitude of the prelates, and particularly Bishop Tait, on the South African question. Nothing can be more discreditable than the attempt made to shift the blame from the right shoulders to others which have nothing to do with it. The real difficulty in the Bishop of London's mind is that he cannot understand such a thing as religious zeal. That any man should join or leave a Communion for any higher reason than

its social and established rank, is a puzzle which the events of his own life have not helped him to solve, and he is unable to see that if the revolution which Dean Stanley and some others like him are trying to bring about were once effected, every man with any sense of religion would abandon the Church of England as by law established.

We may be told that no school can fairly be judged by its newspapers, and that the *Chronicle*, though a Catholic paper, did not treat the Holy Father with much reverence. But the material difference is that the *Chronicle*, though edited with singular ability, came to an end in a few months, because Catholics would not take in a paper the tone of which offended their loyal instincts. The *Church Times*, sold at a penny, has at least circulation enough to maintain it for years.

This fact seems to prove that the number of persons who sympathize with the present movement in the Established Church must be very considerable. Other evidence points to the same conclusion. Besides the *Church Times*, there is the *Church Review*, a fourpenny paper, of much the same principles; and the *Church News*, a penny paper, edited, it is said, by the Rev. F. G. Lee, the active secretary of the Association for Prayer for the Union of Christendom. And there are, besides, the old stagers of High Church newspapers, the *Guardian*, *John Bull*, and we believe several others. It is impossible to suppose that in the days when the Tractarian school looked up to Dr. Newman as an oracle, their numbers can in any degree have approached this. The same conclusion follows from the number of notices which these papers contain of the refitting and decorating of churches all over the country on models more or less "Ritualistic," and certainly at very great expense. We wish we had any means of forming even an approximate estimate of the sums spent thus every year. They must be exceedingly large. This is a somewhat English way of estimating the spread of principles; but certainly it is common sense. It is now stated that there are seventeen London churches "in which the Eucharistic vestments are worn." This implies a very much larger number in which the system is more or less adopted. For be it observed that among these seventeen, such churches as St. Barnabas, Pimlico, are not numbered. There are said to be about one hundred and eighty London churches in which the service is more or less choral. The London churches which have early weekly communion are, we believe, one hundred and twenty-five. Nothing could more strongly illustrate the total change in the standard of clerical duty, and the feelings of congregations, within the last few years. Mr. Bennett's contribution last year to the series

of essays called "The Church and the World," traces the change as to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, of which he says that "in 1867, tacitly, or in circuitous phraseology, the doctrine may still be set aside by a certain party, but openly and before the Church no one dares to gainsay the Catholic doctrine any longer." We may remark in passing how enormous we as Catholics must feel the gain to be, if it is really the case, that attention to Baptism as something of very high and mysterious effects, is really general in a Protestant communion of which Mr. Bennett himself testifies that a few years ago "Baptism as a sacrament was wellnigh lost among the English people. Common basins were brought into the churches, while the fonts were made into flower-pots for the gardens of the parsonage. It is very questionable in many cases, whether the water, when used, really did touch the person of the child meant to be baptized." Considering the vast number of children who die before the age of reason, this change (if it has, as we hope and believe, extensively taken place) is alone abundantly sufficient to repay all that has been done and suffered in bringing about the present revival. And God forbid that we should suppose the benefits of real Baptism to be confined to persons dying in infancy.

Mr. Bennett next enumerates "the doctrine of the Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, and of the Real Presence." Notwithstanding the suspension of Dr. Pusey at Oxford in 1843, the sentence of the Archbishop of Canterbury in person in 1856, and the condemnation of Dr. Forbes, Protestant Bishop of Brechin, in 1858, he boasts, "From that moment the whole question has been suffered to advance in peace. It is preached in the pulpit, it is announced in books, it is taught to children in their catechism, and everywhere it is embraced in faith. And as to the practice which has followed it, how has it gathered round itself all suitable adjuncts for its development!"

His next point is "the use of private devotions and of sacramental confession"—then the desire for the "reunion of the churches, the restoration of religious communities, the revival of church architecture, and the missionary character of the clergy." Through these points we must not now follow him in detail. We need not say that there is none of them in which we can rejoice with as little reserve of sadness as we can in the case of Baptism; for Holy Baptism, if carefully administered by any one who knows what is essential to its validity, is unquestionably valid. With regard to the Holy Eucharist, although it is well that men should believe what God has revealed concerning it, it is sad to think that so many are

being fed with husks which they believe to be the children's bread (*vere panis filiorum*). And yet even here may we not cheerfully hope that He whose mercies are over all His works, and who sees the heart, may feed with special graces many a humble worshipper who receives, nevertheless, no true sacrament; and that to many may be fulfilled the words of a Protestant poet, "My heart was hard," but "I bathed it oft"

With holy blood

Which at a board, while many drunk bare wine,
A Friend did steal into my cup for good—
Ev'n taken inwardly, and most divine
To supple hardnesses.

We confess to a fear that Mr. Bennett and many writers of his school are misled by the natural delusion which leads men to think the persons with whom they live and converse—their own party and clique—to be the nation. We fear they over-estimate the amount of the change which has taken place. Opinions borrowed from the Catholic Church—for instance, the Real Presence and the Sacrifice in the Eucharist—are tolerated now, which were persecuted as lately as 1856. We find it assumed by all the Ritualist writers that this toleration proves that the opinions are now believed by thousands who then believed them to be false and dangerous. We heartily hope it is so; and to a considerable extent we believe it is. Still there is another very obvious explanation, namely, that the country is more and more persuading itself that the best plan is to leave all opinions alone. In the last debate in Convocation several influential bishops openly recommended this as the best plan of dealing with Ritualists. Yet they certainly do not believe their doctrines to be true. And the Upper House, as a body, came to the conclusion, at the same time, that the same line had better be adopted with regard to a Yorkshire clergyman, Mr. Voysey, whose work denying the Incarnation, and all the other great truths of Revelation, they all agreed was so blasphemous that they refused even to read extracts from it. We confess a doubt whether the toleration of Ritualism, if it is finally tolerated, will not be owing to a general spread of indifference, and to fears on the part of the authorities that they cannot safely enforce any doctrine or practice. Mr. Bennett, we see, wishes the Act of Uniformity repealed, so that "though there is only one Church, there might be a thousand ways of worship." We are not sure that things are not tending to that result. One of the ablest of the Ritualist writers, the authoress of the "autobiography" in the series called "The Church and the

World," has published, in another series, a striking pamphlet, in which she maintains that those whom she calls "Protestants" cannot honestly remain in the Church of England. She attempts to confirm this by quoting the words of the "Prayer Book" for ordination, &c. The argument is strong to any one who has not discovered that there is hardly any opinion within the wide compass of those ever held either in the Catholic Church or the chief Protestant sects, for which a very plausible case cannot be made out from the Prayer Book. She says also what is certainly true, and what she confirms by writers of their own school, that the religion of the so-called Evangelical school is rapidly dying out, and maintains that the English nation will soon be Ritualist; not that the Ritualists are the majority, but that the religious part of the nation is more and more being swallowed up by them. She says, "'Englishmen will never submit to priestcraft and belief in the sacramental system' is the cry of one side; 'The English nation is rapidly being swallowed up in the superstitions from which it once emancipated itself' is the lamentation of the other. The reason of this contrariety is that one side counts by the irreligious section of the country, and the other by those to whom religion is the most important of all things. It is these last who determine the faith of kingdoms, and to a certain extent regulate the type even of the unbelief. Christians in France are far outnumbered by infidels;* but it is because those Christians are Catholic that France is Catholic; and the unbelief is of a species which scorns Protestants far more than it does Catholics. French infidels, if converted, would never become Protestants. In fact, the most remarkable genius to which modern France has given birth, *Auguste Comte*, acknowledges that Catholicism is the only creed which can contend on anything like equal terms with Positivism; whereas Protestantism, as a merely destructive system, possesses no true vitality, and must perish so soon as it has fulfilled its task of destroying—a task infinitely lower in kind and in results than that of building up." We have quoted this passage because we think it true with one exception—an exception which has an important bearing on the writer's views, viz., that Ritualism is evidently merely a transitory form; and the real effect of the state of things which the author sees can hardly fail to be that, although England

* This is not true of France, but only of a certain limited circle extending some thirty or forty leagues round Paris. However, that part of France is so influential that the writer's argument to a great degree holds good, despite of this inaccuracy.

may not be, in the true sense of the word, Catholic, the time seems rapidly coming when those of our countrymen who have any religion at all will be Catholics, and then the country will be, in the sense she describes, a Catholic country. To this happy result we firmly believe the spread of Ritualism to be one important step.

We are not surprised that Catholics should feel tempted to something of indignation when they read the writings of the new school. We cannot help sharing this feeling. It is provoking to find members of a sect so evidently Protestant as the Established Church quietly using concerning themselves and their fellows all the language of Catholics;—when a well-to-do rector who a few years back would have been inclined to laugh if any one had told him he was a priest, tells us with a grave face that he cannot come to breakfast because he is going “to say his Mass” at a funeral a little later;—when a gentleman like Mr. Lyne,* who even in the Protestant communion is only a “deacon,” tells us that he is (save the mark!) a Benedictine Abbot, and professes to excommunicate the members of his community;—when a gentleman like Mr. Bennett, who himself practises a whole system of worship which (so far as it is at all like Catholic worship) has been kept up in what he calls the Roman Church for eighteen hundred years—and for the last three, in spite of perpetual persecution as well as protest from the very body which Mr. Bennett represents,—when such a man, under such circumstances, instead of falling down to sue for pardon, imitates as closely as he can the very practices which his sect has so long reviled and persecuted and then modestly tells us, “My private opinion is that [the Church of Rome has fallen from itself, and from its ancient integrity, and from the Apostolic Churches,] by making confession compulsory.” Moreover, since Catholics are after all only men, it is naturally provoking to a man who has comparatively a hard struggle in life, only because his family has been impoverished and shut out of all careers for some three

* This is the gentleman who is represented in the “Comedy of Convocation” as expressing his regret that he was interrupted just as he was on the point of asking Cardinal Barnabo several important questions,—“Whether there was any Catholic precedent by which an individual might appoint himself Superior of a religious order of his own creation without having made any previous novitiate? Whether, if his Bishop was an ignorant heretic, he might treat his foolish opposition with contempt? Whether, in case of necessity, he might teach his church, supposing his church to be incapable of teaching him? Whether, if he should be excommunicated by all his monks, and should excommunicate them all in return, it was his duty or theirs to pay the debts of the monastery? Whether—

centuries, by penal laws passed by the influence of Anglican prelates, and the repeal of which those Prelates opposed as a tampering with Anti-Christ; and who, even now that those laws are repealed, finds himself met everywhere by a system of social persecution almost more hard to bear, and which is carefully maintained by the Anglican prelates and clergy of to-day—or, again, to a man who was once an Anglican, and has deliberately subjected himself and his family to poverty and social exclusion, only that he might be a Catholic—to either of such men it is naturally a little provoking to be told by a smug, well-to-do young man who has risen and is rising in a gainful profession, that he and those in whose place he stands have been the true Catholics all the time. Nature naturally rebels at such things as these. But, if this movement is on the whole working round for the salvation of souls and the glory of God, grace may well lead us to bear much more than these petty insults and provocations. And that such really is the case we cannot doubt. It is a great gain that thousands confess truths revealed by God which they once blasphemed and ridiculed. And, more than this, it is a gain still greater that by degrees the prejudices which have so long veiled the minds of Englishmen of all classes in Egyptian darkness, and made it morally impossible for them to see the brightness and glory of the Catholic Church, have already been removed from the hearts of thousands. An ordinary Englishman, thirty years ago, really and truly believed all the monstrous, almost unimaginable horrors which have been handed down by a Protestant tradition to the dishonour of the Church. Such a man was, humanly speaking, as little likely ever even to think of becoming a Catholic, as to think of becoming a Mahometan or an Hindhu. He never thought of looking into a Catholic Church or of opening a Catholic book. How utterly he was in darkness as to what it all meant we may imagine, when such a man as Dr. Newman records that as late as 1833, when he had been for some years a clergyman, and had already written his learned work on the Arians, he “knew nothing of the Presence of the Blessed Sacrament” in the Catholic churches into which he accidentally strayed while waiting at Palermo for a passage to England. Instead of this totally ignorant generation sincerely believing that all the points in which the “Roman Church” differed from their own were “pagan superstitions” and “abominations,” the Ritualists are giving us a generation, thousands of which will have been trained from their childhood to believe that all the distinctive doctrines of the Catholic Church against

which Protestants have for centuries been blaspheming, are living and life-giving truths,—the Real Presence—the Sacrifice of the Mass—confession and absolution—the religious life and vows—the invocation of the Saints. All these things, which the last generation believed to be worse than paganism, they know to be truth and life. Can any man doubt that this change has relieved the task of the Church in England of half its difficulty? Astronomers tell us that those strange visitors of our system, the meteoric stones, have been revolving in space probably for ages, until some chance has brought them so near the earth that they have for the first time felt the power of its attraction. Have not multitudes of souls been brought by this movement from far-distant wanderings in regions of darkness and cold, to a position, as yet indeed outside the Church, but yet sufficiently near to her to ensure their feeling her attraction? Does not each one of us know in his own experience many cases in which that attraction has prevailed?

There is no doubt another and deeper feeling which, in many a loving heart, turns to bitterness what would be the joy with which it would watch this movement;—it is the feeling that dear friends for whose conversion to the one Church we would give our very heart's blood, are held back, and perhaps may be held back even to the last, by their belief in a sham. That so it is in one and another instance cannot be denied. Nor do we see how this complaint is to be answered, except so far as it is an answer to say, Wait, and hope, and pray. How many now safe in the Church on earth, or already passed from it to the Church beyond the veil, were once entangled, as it seemed, beyond all hope of being extricated, in the same or similar shams. The time came—they themselves in many cases knew not how or why—when the Lord of Light was pleased to shine upon their darkness. The time and the means He best knows.

One fear which we well know harasses many Catholics is, we are firmly convinced, a delusion—the fear that those who have come so near to the Church, and who seem to us to have come as near as they can without the sacrifice of “all that they have,” cannot possibly be sincere in professing, that they are willing and ready to take the last step if they could see it to be the will of God. God only can judge the hearts of individuals. Cases we know there have been, years ago, of men who have clearly seen that it was the will of God that they should, at vast earthly sacrifices, seek union with Him through the one true Church, and who have not forced themselves to make the sacrifice. Some even of these, so great is the long-suffering

of God, after long waiting, and after seeming to have silenced the voice of conscience, which they had refused to hear, have at last heard and obeyed it. Others (and we fear this is the more common case) have lost all desire to be Catholics, losing with it in some cases all belief in revealed truth, in others all religious earnestness. We doubt not that there are others, whose moral probation, whether or not they will obey the known will of God, is at this moment going on, and whose future in this world and the world to come is at this moment trembling in the balance. So solemn is this world in which we live so thoughtlessly. Neither, again, can we doubt that there may be others who, though they have not consciously rejected what they knew to be a heavenly call, are really responsible for an ignorance which has been the result of their own neglect and resistance of grace. The conviction that there are such cases, and that we are no judges of their number, forbids us to form any decision of the state of individuals. But we cannot read their writings, and, much more, we cannot hear what we do of their lives, without being convinced that as a class these men are really feeling and groping, although in much darkness, yet in the main with a single eye, after their God and Saviour.

To this consideration of their lives we attach much importance. An easy theoretical Anglo-Catholicism, defended with ingenious arguments by men who show no inclination to sacrifice anything for it, seems to us worth very little indeed. But that there is widely prevalent in the modern school a temper far removed from this, would seem to be demonstrated, if by nothing else, at least by missions such as that of S. George's-in-the-East, worked by Protestant clergymen and the sisterhoods of Protestant ladies. Works like these may have done harm in individual cases, by satisfying, at least for a time, hearts which, if the Establishment were visibly what it was thirty years since, would before now have discovered that their true home is in the one Church; but we know that any really good work must be of God, not of men; and we cannot doubt that such works as these—undertaken for His sake—must bring down His blessing upon those who labour in them, and upon many others.

One unpleasant symptom which has perhaps disgusted some of our readers with the whole movement, is the extreme bitterness shown by many of the Ritualists against converts to the Church. Probably there are none of us who have not observed this. It is very wrong, but it is a natural feeling for which great allowance should be made. We must not forget

that the one fatal symptom of the movement is that one by one its best and most earnest disciples leave it for the Church. Those who stay behind, believing that it is the position which God has appointed for English people, are naturally more sore with those who thus desert them than with any other class of people on earth. It is the one thing they cannot bear, and hence converts are the one class of men of whom they cannot think or speak with common fairness. We need not say that this is far more necessarily the case with those who feel that they ought themselves to have submitted to the Church, but who have not had courage to follow their conscience. We can say, on personal knowledge, that some of the most cruel acts of persecution against poor persons who have become Catholics have been instigated and committed by men of whom we personally know that they were not long before on the very point of conversion, and of whom we felt it more difficult to hope that they were following their conscience than in almost any other case. This of course is natural. We are sorry to see, however, that all the Ritualist writers whom we have read are so far led away by this feeling as to assume that every convert has left the Church of England from "impatience," from being unable to wait, from not seeing that the victory would ultimately be on the side of truth, &c. We see with real regret that even John Keble, loving as is his general tone, allows himself to insinuate something of this kind. The writer of the autobiography which we have quoted assumes it still more positively. Mr. Bennett ("Church and the World") says of Dr. Newman that he "fled too hurriedly to a new communion," and of the converts in general that they "abandoned their allegiance and fled, some for one reason and some for another, and were even as hirelings, because they cared not for the sheep."

This is merely an unfounded and gratuitous imputation of motives. If the converts had acted on the motives which these writers attribute to them, they would, no doubt, have sinned grievously. A man who quits the communion in which the providence of God has allowed him to be born from mere personal pique or disappointment, certainly does wrong—much more wrong if on such grounds he abandons the cure of souls when he has undertaken it. Such resolves can be defended only on one ground, namely, that the man is seriously convinced, after much examination, study, and prayer, that it is the will of God that he should change to another religion, and that if he does not obey that known will he will be guilty of grievous sin. When a man is deliberately convinced of this, how can he refuse to move? Mr. Bennett gives, in page 6

of his essay, the names of eight converts, all clergymen, to whom he applies this censure. We undertake to say that, if space allowed it, we could show that every one of these eight has solemnly and deliberately declared that this, and this alone, was the ground of his conversion. Mr. Bennett may think they were mistaken; but that no more justifies him in imputing to them motives which they solemnly repudiate, than they would be justified in imputing to him unworthy motives for remaining in the Established Church. To say nothing of those who still survive, what right has Mr. Bennett to set aside the touching declaration of the late Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce as to his reasons for quitting the Church of England? So far from leaving it in despair, the writer of these pages can testify that he, some time before, expressed the strongest conviction that the opposition then raging would pass away, *if only men's own consciences* allowed them to retain their positions. He left the Church of England, not because he feared any persecution or opposition, but solely because his conscience would no longer permit him to remain in it; because, after having taken every means, natural and supernatural, for ascertaining the truth, he was deliberately and permanently convinced that the authority of the Pope is from God, and because his position in the Church of England implied the rejection of it. The intellectual grounds of this conviction he stated and explained in a learned book on "Church authority"; and in announcing his practical resolution, he said, "Whether I was right . . . I leave to the reader's judgment. I can only say that my resolution was not taken without counting the cost. For if these pages should find their way into any fair parsonage where everything within and without speaks of comfort and peace,—where sympathizing neighbours present an object to the affections, and the bell from an adjoining ancient tower invites the inmates, morning and evening, to consecrate each successive day to God's service; and if the reader's thoughts suggest to him that it is impossible to unloose ties so binding, or to transplant himself from his ancient seat when he is too old to take root in a new soil, let him be assured that such also have been the feelings of the writer. It is at such times that the promises of Scripture come home to the heart with a freshness which eighteen centuries have not diminished: 'There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake and the Gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold more in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions, and in the world to come eternal life.' " That down to

Feb. 3rd, 1857, he was, day by day, more and more confidently assured that his practical trust on this promise had not been mistaken, we well know. For any further proof of the wisdom of his choice we may well await that Day when all secrets shall be revealed. ἀμὴν ταῦτα ἔρχονται Κύριε Ἰησοῦν.

ART. VI.—S. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.

The Life and Martyrdom of S. Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury and Legate of the Holy See. By JOHN MORRIS, Canon of Northampton.

History of the Contest between Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Henry II., King of England. By the late Rev. R. H. FROUDE, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

IN a previous article on S. Thomas of Canterbury, in the last number of the DUBLIN REVIEW, we left him having just escaped the snares of King Henry and reached the shores of France, in October, 1164, at which period we resume our narrative.

The great highway of the Cross was now full before our Saint. Stripped of all his earthly possessions, disgraced and degraded, so far as he could do it, by the very man to whose service he had given the best years of his life and strength, he was driven forth to wander an exile in a foreign land. This was in itself hardship enough: for S. Thomas was not a Norman noble, but a complete Englishman in his feelings at least; and the constant yearnings he had after his native country, notwithstanding the kind hospitality of the French, formed one of the bitterest drops in the chalice of suffering which awaited him.

King Henry heard of his victim's escape with anger too deep for utterance. When he could express himself he said, "We have not yet done with him." He then selected a body of bishops and nobles to repair to the Pope to make the appeal promised on the part of the former against S. Thomas. Of course all the Saint's bitterest opponents were selected, and amongst them Gilbert of London. The King also wrote letters to the King of France and the Earl of Flanders, begging them not to receive into their dominions a traitor whom he called the *late* Archbishop of Canterbury.

Both the Archbishop's party and the King's were bound to Sens, where the Pope then was; and S. Thomas having found

fresh danger from Henry's machinations with the Earl of Flanders, in the territories of that prince, had proceeded to Soissons, where he was in the dominions of the King of France. There he remained while Herbert and another of his suite were sent on to the Pope, waiting on the King of France on their road. Pope Alexander had taken up his abode in the city of Sens in consequence of the struggle which was going on between him and the antipope, a contest of which Henry did not fail to make good use in his battle with S. Thomas.

Such was the history of persecution, trial, and suffering which Herbert and his companion on their arrival at Sens had to relate to the Holy Father of their Archbishop, that the Pope said, weeping, "Your Lord is yet alive, you tell me; he can then while still in the flesh claim the privilege of martyrdom."

If we wanted proof of the heroic tenderness of our Saint, that "liquefaction of the heart," as some one expresses it in speaking of the Curé d'Ars, possessed by the Saints, we should find it in S. Thomas's deep feeling and affection for his friends and those who walked with him in the steep and rugged road of the Cross; for whom throughout his wanderings and exile he was always feeling more than for himself, and whose privations and sufferings on his account went near to break a spirit which seemed to rise indomitable above its own sharpest afflictions. And the attachment to him of Herbert his chaplain, John of Salisbury his friend, and the Prior of Merton his former tutor, and indeed of all those with whom he had been associated in the more intimate relations of life, was unbounded and euthusiastic.

The bishops and King's messengers made their appearance at Sens about the same time as the friends of the Archbishop; and both on this and every succeeding occasion in the negotiations between the contending parties, the bishops spared no pains to misrepresent the conduct of the Archbishop to the Roman authorities. He was, they said, hasty, overbearing, intolerant, and obstinate; or, as the Bishop of London expressed it on a later occasion, "he strikes before he threatens, suspends and excommunicates before he admonishes." While on the other hand they spoke of our fierce and absolute Plantagenet, as if he were a meek, gentle, much-injured monarch, only seeking his own rights and the good government of his kingdom. But Gilbert Foliot could not keep charity in speaking of his rival, so that on one occasion the Pope called out to him to "spare." The Bishop misunderstanding him said, "Shall I spare him, my Lord?" "Brother" said

the Holy Father, “I said not spare *him*, but *thyself*,” on which Foliot held his tongue with confusion.

The Pope, however, was aware of the real characters of the persons with whom he had to deal in this great controversy; as is clearly shown in a letter written by him to this very Gilbert Foliot, about the end of 1165 or early in 1166.

Hereby, then, we warn and charge you to choose an early opportunity, such as your intimacy with his Majesty the King of England will doubtless afford you, of laying before his Majesty the heinous nature of his conduct. You are to bid him discontinue the practice in which he has hitherto persisted, of confusing secular and ecclesiastical causes, so that the affairs of the Church may henceforth be arranged by churchmen, and none but matters strictly civil be brought before his Majesty’s judges. Moreover, he is forthwith to receive our venerable brother the Archbishop of Canterbury with the honour due to his station, and to reinstate him, together with his fellow exiles, in their former rights and possessions. . . . Moreover, you yourself are to render to the See of Canterbury that submission which is due from you to Christ, inasmuch as the things of Cæsar are due to Cæsar, and the things of God to God.*

In another letter to the same person the Pope seems still more fully to see that his Lordship of London, as well as his patron, were to be distrusted.

THE POPE TO THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

Statements are frequently made to us respecting you, which consist ill with your monastic character and exterior deportment, and which, if substantiated, must shake our confidence in the sincerity of your professions.

It is not gratitude, nor love, nor fear, that will justify you in the neglect of your sacred functions, and in abandoning the cause of the Church. Rather ought you to stand forth with manly constancy as its firmest pillar, fearing God and not man. Remember that when wicked men oppress the Church, the truest love would lead you not merely to protest against them, but to raise your voice unceasingly, as it were a trumpet: always remembering the prophet’s words, “*Nisi annunciareritis iniquo iniquitatem suam, sanguinem ejus de manu tuâ requiram.*”

Meantime the King of England wrote thus to his friend, on hearing of the well-earned spiritual censures with which the Primate had visited his rebellious suffragan:—

THE KING TO THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

I have heard of the grievance which that traitor Thomas, my adversary, has inflicted on you and other dignitaries of my realm; nor am I less indig-

* Froude, p. 110.

nant at this outrage in your case than if he had vomited out his poison against myself. Be assured that I shall use all my influence with his Lordship the Pope, and the King of France, and all my friends among the Cardinals, that he may be disabled from doing uself and our realm any further injury.*

The Bishop of London was especially pleasing to Henry from his envy of S. Thomas, which had led him from the first to put forward certain claims which he contended the See of London had over the Archbischopric of Canterbury : London having been, he said, in early times, before the introduction of Christianity, the chief city of religious worship. Could he have prevailed on Rome to recognize it as the seat of the Primacy, and himself in consequence as Primate—and he really seems to have had hopes of this,—the whole quarrel would of course have come to an end, and an Archbishop after the King's own heart would have succeeded to S. Thomas.

John of Salisbury speaks with force, joined with much wit, on this subject, and in a letter to the Chapter of Canterbury he writes thus :—

It is a boast of his [the Bishop of London] that London was in former times the seat of the Arch-flamen, when the worship of Jupiter prevailed. Perhaps, as he is so wise and religious a person, he would have no objection to see the worship of Jupiter brought back again ; and if he cannot be Archbishop, he may at any rate have the name and title of Arch-flamen. He relies on a prophecy of Merlin, who, under some impulse I know not what, foretold, before the coming of S. Augustine into England, that when the dignity of London should be transferred to Dover, the Christian religion would be destroyed and restored again. However the disciple of Merlin, knowing that his master is no mighty authority, has had recourse, they say, to stronger arguments. He reckons upon the power of the prince, and the weakness of the Church ; upon the avarice of the Roman Court ; upon your pusillanimity ; upon the Archbishop's poverty and his own wealth ; which he thinks will make him prevail in his vanity against the wisdom and justice of God.†

Foliot's chief strength against his Primate, however, seems to have lain with the King ; for most of the other bishops, though weak and wavering in the hour of trial, and terrified from their duty by the royal threats, would not on the whole depart from their allegiance to the See of Canterbury.

It has ever been the policy of the Court of Rome to deal with all her children as a loving mother, whose anxiety is not less, nay is greater, for the erring members of her family, than for those of whose piety and goodness she is sure. Not only

* Froude.

† Froude, p. 425.

was King Henry her child, but he held in his grasp the souls of such myriads of her other children, that she paused ere she struck a blow which might place him and herself in open variance. Henry took all the advantage of this hesitation which could be taken by a wily and cruel foe, to force S. Thomas forward into a concession of those principles for which he was contending.

S. Thomas's first step in his banishment was to resign his Archbishopric into the hands of the Pope, as fearing that his election had been influenced by the King's wishes; but Alexander at once restored it to him, declaring that his conduct had proved him to be the most fit person for that office. He then retired to the Cistercian Monastery of Pontigni, where, by the kindness and favour of the King of France, he had a safe asylum. And while in this retirement, he had time to reflect on the sad state of his spouse, the Church of Canterbury. Exiled, ruined, and separated from her as he was, it must have added no little to his cruel trial to remember that he left her also in the hands of his bitterest enemies, the de Brocs, who speedily possessed themselves of his castle of Saltwode and other manors belonging to him. The King was resolved that his victim should experience the fullest effects of opposing his will; and with a refinement of cruelty, made use of his knowledge of his former favourite's disposition, to invent an appropriate measure of persecution. Well did King Henry know the loving and tender heart of his former Chancellor, and its deep sympathies for those in distress; and rightly did he measure the heroic and unselfish generosity, to which it would be a far more exquisite torment to see others ruined and homeless on his account, than to endure those miseries himself. Putting the de Brocs at the head of this noble enterprise against the helpless and poor, Henry issued a sentence of banishment against all who were connected with the Primate either by blood or friendship.

Four hundred unhappy exiles were sent forth from their hearths. The sentence went out on Christmas-day, as if this sad band should be headed by the Prince of Exiles. And as the crowd of his friends and relatives, and even all who were supposed to adhere to his opinions, were driven to his place of banishment, homeless, destitute, starving, in the dead of winter, under sickness, weakness, and whatever other circumstances could add to the terrors of such a fate, S. Thomas must have realized to the full that interior martyrdom which likens the soul more fully to its Lord than even a violent death for His sake.

Often, while chancellor, had he longed for quiet and retire-

ment to devote himself to sacred studies ; and the duties of Archbishop, even, had not permitted him leisure to fulfil his desires in this respect. But now, in the deep retirement of Pontigni, the Saint gave full vent to his thirst for study and prayer ; to which he joined all the austeries to which the love of his vehement spirit urged him, burning as it was now in the purifying fires of suffering. He tried to follow all the rigours observed by the severe Cistercians in their diet ; and when he became ill from this, he used the cold stream that flowed past the monastery as an instrument of mortification. But these bodily penances, severe as they were, were but the exterior additions to the great interior work, the shaping of the Image of the Crucified in his soul. What he felt at the consideration of the miserable state of his See of Canterbury, and indeed the whole Church in England, in bonds for his sake and under a cruel oppressor, may be seen by the following extracts from some of his letters to Henry, when, being invested with legatine powers by the Pope, he tried to make some impression on the hard heart of his former friend. The gentle, yet solemn, warning tone of these letters must forcibly strike the reader.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY TO THE KING OF ENGLAND.

To his most revered Lord Henry, by the grace of God the illustrious King of England, Duke of Normandy and Aquitain, and Count of Angers, Thomas by the same grace the humble minister of the Church of Canterbury, health and a holy life.

I entreat you, O my lord, to bear with me for a while, that by the grace of God I may disburden my conscience to the benefit of your soul. I am troubled on all sides ; tribulation and anguish have found me out. Whether I speak or keep silence, evil awaits me every way. If I am silent, woe is me, for how shall I escape His hands who saith : “ If thou speakest not to warn the wicked from his way, to save his life, his blood will I require at thy hand ! ” If I speak out, then, I dread the wrath of my lord. Yet it is safer to face the wrath of man, than to fall into the hands of the living God. Therefore, trusting in His mercy, in Whose hands are the hearts of kings, and Who turneth them severally as He will, now that I have broken silence I will speak on. My lord, the daughter of Sion is held captive in thy kingdom. The Spouse of the great King is oppressed by her enemies, afflicted by those who ought most to honour her, and especially by you. O remember what great things God has done for you ; release her, reinstate her in her kingdom, and take away the reproach from your generation.

Trust in my words, my beloved lord ; God is a judge slow to anger and long-suffering, but an avenger most terrible. Hearken to me and amend your ways, lest some day the Almighty gird His sword upon His thigh and deliver His Spouse with a mighty hand. If it be that you shall hear my words, and prove yourself from this day forward God’s faithful soldier, then He will

bless you greatly, and give glory to your sons and to your sons' sons. But if not, then truly I dread (may God avert it !) that the sword shall not depart from thy house till the Most High has made clean vengeance for His people. Remember, my lord, how after God had chosen Solomon, and given him wisdom and prosperity, yet because he turned back from the way of God, and repented not in due time of his iniquities, therefore was his kingdom rent from him and given to his servant. Whereas David, his father, obtained pardon because he humbled himself at once, and sought it from the Lord. May my lord the king do likewise.

The second is written in a yet more intimate and affectionate tone of warning and rebuke.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY TO THE KING OF ENGLAND.

To his Lord and friend Henry, by the grace of God King of England, &c. Thomas, by the same grace, the humble minister of the Church of Canterbury, his own once after the flesh, and now much more in the spirit, may he repent and amend his ways.

Waiting I have waited for the day when God should turn your Majesty from crooked ways and evil counsels ; silently and anxiously have I waited for the tidings of my son and lord the King of England, who was once seduced by the enemies of the Church ; being by the grace of God restored to it in abundant humility, and though I wait in vain, still I weary not, but pray for your Majesty day by day.

Yet now am I straitened above measure, for a spiritual power * has been assigned to me by the same God under Whom you hold temporal dominion, and my office constrains me to address your Majesty in a manner which, as yet, my exile has prevented. It is my duty to exhort your Majesty, nay, to warn and rebuke you, lest if in anything you have done amiss, which indeed you have, my silence may endanger my own soul. Consider then, most mighty prince, that the royal power in each separate realm cannot more justly interfere with the polity of Christ's Universal Church, than the private rights of any town in your Majesty's dominions with your Majesty's prerogative. The most ancient usage has established, that in causes where the priesthood is concerned only priests should pronounce judgment. The great Emperor Constantine declined to interfere in such. Indeed all history teaches us that it is the custom of Christian princes to submit themselves to the Church, not to rule over it ; the authority of the priesthood being so much weightier than that of kings, in proportion as they who are entrusted with it have to render their account concerning kings themselves. The Bishop's sentence has before now sufficed to excommunicate king and emperor too. Pope Innocent excommunicated the Emperor Arcadius ; S. Ambrose the great Theodosius ; and that, too, for a cause which the other clergy deemed a light one. Yet he earned absolution by a notable penance. King

* S. Thomas here refers to the office of Legate conferred upon him by the Pope, of which we shall speak presently.

David bowed before the prophet Nathan, and obtained pardon. Be converted, then, my beloved son, my royal master, and follow the man after God's own heart.—(Froude, pp. 139, 140, 141.)

These letters to one who had been to S. Thomas, indeed, as he called him, "his beloved son and royal master," and had become his most bitter opponent, evince the cruel anxieties from which our Saint suffered; and the imploring tone of a betrayed and injured friend, joined with the dignified rebuke of the servant and priest of God to his spiritual and temporal lord, is very touching.

S. Thomas, however, continued to employ his exile in deep communication with his God, and perfecting his soul and preparing it for that bloody crown which it pleased his Lord to forewarn him was awaiting him.

One day while he was praying before the altar of S. Stephen, after having said Mass, he heard a voice calling him twice by his name, "Thomas! Thomas!" "Who art Thou, Lord?" the Saint asked; and the Lord replied, "I am Jesus Christ, thy Lord and Brother; My Church shall be glorified in thy blood, and thou shalt be glorified in Me." The Abbot of Pontigni, who was waiting for S. Thomas, heard the words; but our Saint bound him to secrecy until the words should be fulfilled. Our Lord also sent him a second vision in which the very circumstances of his martyrdom were portrayed before him so vividly that he seemed overpowered with sorrow and heaviness after it; yet such was the heavenliness of this spirit, now almost purified to take its flight to the realms of peace, that when he was questioned on the subject, it appeared that his sorrow and care was, like his blessed Master's, for those he must leave behind him on earth, rather than for himself.

"But what has a man who eats and drinks to do with martyrdom?" asked the Abbot of the monastery, smiling, of our Saint, in whom he (who was a stranger just come) saw but a man who looked to him like others, while his soul was hid with Christ in God. S. Thomas replied in deepest humility, "I know that I am too fond of worldly pleasures, but the Lord is good, Who justifies the wicked, and He has deigned to reveal this to me, who am all unworthy."

The persecution of the Saint at the King's hands continued. The monks of Pontigni were now informed that if they continued to harbour King Henry's enemy, that prince would drive all their order out of his dominions. They grieved sorely at having to part with their holy guest, but the royal threats were peremptory, and they had no courage to resist them.

The great enemies and bitterest persecutors of God's saints become, in fact, their greatest benefactors, as these holy ones are the first to feel; and the meek and gentle patience of S. Thomas as he discussed with his followers where they could next lay their homeless heads, and his playful remarks to them under this new suffering, remind us of S. Elizabeth's sweet and heroic bearing when she was driven forth homeless by her ruthless brothers-in-law, or was precipitated into the muddy stream by a former object of her charity. And when we remember the passionate temperament, high spirit, and vehement disposition of S. Thomas, we shall see the more clearly the great work which had been effected in his soul by the grace of God. And then came temptations. On one occasion when they met during this long exile, the King said to him, "O why do you not do my will? I certainly would put everything into your hands." Which reminded him, he said, of the passage in Scripture: "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me."

How many even good people would have thought that here was perhaps an opportunity of reclaiming the King from his evil ways, regaining the old power the Archbishop had over that monarch, and thus by degrees working things round to the ultimate good of the Church. But Saints see things only from one point of view, and that is their Lord's. They regard the events of this life as God regards them, not as man. They keep God's will straight before them, and turn neither to the right hand nor to the left, to follow the sophistries of human prudence. No one realized more fully than our Saint all that he renounced to fight for Christ. "Little should I have needed their patronage," says he, speaking of his enemies, "if I had chosen to forsake the Church and yield to his [the King's] wilfulness myself. I might have flourished in wealth and abundance of delicacies. I might have been feared, courted, honoured, and might have provided for my own in luxury and worldly glory as I pleased. But because God called me to the government of His Church, an unworthy sinner as I was, and most wretched though flourishing in the world's goods beyond my countrymen, through His grace preventing and assisting me, I chose rather to be an outcast from the palace, to be exiled, proscribed, and to finish my life in the last wretchedness than to sell the Church's liberty and to prefer the iniquitous traditions of men to the law of God." Then, as it were in a spirit of prophecy, he adds: "For myself I know that my own days are few; and that unless I declare to the wicked man his ways, his blood will shortly be required at my hands, by One

from Whom no patronage can protect me. There silver and gold will be profitless, and gifts, that blind the eyes of wise ones. We shall soon stand all of us before the tribunal of Christ, and by His Majesty and terrible judgment I conjure your Holiness, as my Father and Lord, and as the Supreme Judge on earth, to render justice to His Church and to myself, against those who seek my life to take it away."

The King of France, Louis VII., whose name deserves to be gratefully remembered for his early reverence for and appreciation of so great a Saint, came forward on this, as on every other occasion in his power, to the assistance of the Archbishop. On hearing that he was hunted from his retreat at Pontigni by his cruel persecutor, he expressed his surprise and concern at the event, crying out to those near him, "O Religion, O Religion, where art thou? Those whom we believed dead to the world fear its threats, and, professing to despise the things that perish, for their sake turn back from the work of God, which they had taken in hand, and drive God's Exile from them." King Louis then sent him this message by his faithful Herbert:—"Salute your lord the Archbishop," he said, "and promise him in my name that though the world and those who are dead to the world desert him, I will not. Let him tell us what city or castle, or other place of our dominions, he would prefer, and he shall find it prepared for him." S. Thomas chose the royal Abbey of St. Columba, near Sens, where he remained as the guest of the King of France from St. Martin's day, Nov. 11th, 1166, until his exile was terminated by the crown of martyrdom.

There S. Thomas, still pursuing the penitential life which he had laid down for himself, failed not to continue to do battle for the Church and the rights of the Holy See. "By a sentence promulgated with more than usual solemnity," says Lingard,* "he cut off from the society of the Faithful such of the royal ministers as had communicated with the antipope, those who had framed the Constitutions of Clarendon, and all who had invaded the property of the Church." When at Vezelay, on his road to Sens from Pontigni, S. Thomas had celebrated High Mass on the festival of Pentecost; and after the Gospel he preached a forcible sermon, in which, with deepest emotion, he warned King Henry by name of the sentence of the Church hanging over him. It is well known that in the midst of the King's reckless audacity and contumacy, he had still faith enough

* Lingard, vol. ii. p. 230.

to dread this sword of the Church above all things. He therefore sent constant letters and messengers to Pope Alexander, endeavouring at once to undermine the Primate's character at Rome and to induce the Pontiff to believe that he was willing to come to an arrangement and be reconciled to S. Thomas; while the Bishop of London, who had himself been punished with excommunication by S. Thomas for his contumacy and disobedience, continued to spare no pains to traduce his Archbishop in the same quarter. It was in the hope of giving a little time to accommodate matters between so powerful a monarch as Henry and the Primate of his dominions, that the Pope had issued the letters of legatine suspension for S. Thomas, of which we are about to speak. For the cup of his sufferings was not yet full, and it remained that they should come upon him in yet greater force than heretofore, from that quarter where his strength lay, and to which his devotion and loyalty were highest.

The course held by Rome and the Holy Father, who now encouraged him and then, through prudence and caution towards Henry, gave certain advantages to his enemies, tried the Archbishop to the very soul.

Alexander had appointed S. Thomas legate of the Holy See in England, thereby empowering him to exercise spiritual censures against his opponents. The latter however no sooner felt his arm lifted against them, than they fled to Rome with fresh appeals against him; and finally, backed by the constant and powerful support and threats of King Henry, they obtained the Archbishop's temporary suspension from his office of Legate.

Perhaps there was no description of affliction which would have wrung the heart of S. Thomas so keenly, as the suspension from his legatine powers by the very hand of that authority, to preserve whose rights intact he was suffering exile, want, and all the worst evils of this life. We will hear his account of himself and his sorrows in a letter he wrote on this occasion to the Pope.

O my Father, my soul is in bitterness; the letters in which your Holiness was pleased to suspend me have made myself and my unhappy fellow-exiles a very scorn of men, and outcast of the people, and what grieves me worse, have delivered up God's Church to the will of its enemies.

Our persecutor had held out sure hopes to the Earl of Flanders, and others of the French nobility, that he meant to make peace with us. But his messengers arrived with their new powers from your Holiness, and all was at an end. What could our friends do for us when thus repulsed by your Holiness's act, and smitten down as with the club of Hercules? Would that your Holiness's ear could hear what is said of this matter by the bishops,

nobles, and commons of both realms : and that your eye could see the scandal with which it has filled the French court. What is there that this man may not now look for, when, through agents famous only for their crimes, he has circumvented those who have the key of knowledge, overthrown the ministers of justice, and seared the majesty of the Apostolic See ? It is no longer doubted that John of Oxford deceived your Holiness, and with impunity ; and, surely, to be deceived once in such a matter is inconvenient ; nor will the English Church quickly recover from the ill effects of it, dissemble as it may. But that venerable Abbot of St. Augustine's, once a runaway monk, for his merits excommunicate, who dilapidates and pollutes the Church he governs, has, with his fellow-envoys, practised a far worse deception. For lo ! this king, whose sole hope rests on the chance of your Holiness's death or mine, has obtained the very thing he wishes,—a fresh delay, in which one or other of these events may happen ;—God avert them.

But your Holiness counsels me to bear with patience the meanwhile. . . .

And do you not observe, O Father, what this "meanwhile" may bring about to the injury of the Church and of your Holiness's reputation ? "Meanwhile" the King applies to his own purposes the revenues of the vacant abbeys and bishoprics, and will not suffer pastors to be ordained there. "Meanwhile," he riots in uncontrolled insolence against the parishes, churches, holy places, and the whole sacred order. "Meanwhile," he and the other persecutors of the Church make their will their law. "Meanwhile," who is to take charge of the sheep of Christ, and save them from the jaws of wolves, who no longer prowl around, but have entered the fold and devour and tear, and slay, with none to resist them ? For what pastor is there whose voice you have not silenced ? What bishop have you not suspended in suspending me !

This act of your Holiness's is alike unexampled and unmerited, and will do the work of tyrants in other days as well as yours. Your Holiness has set an example ready to their hands ; and, doubtless, this man and his posterity, unless your Holiness takes steps to ordain otherwise, will draw it into a precedent. He and his nobles, whatever be their crime, will claim, among the privileges of the realm, exemption from any sentence of excommunication or Interdict till authorized by the Apostolic See ; then, in time, when the evil has taken root, neither will the Chief Priest of Rome himself find any in the whole kingdom to take part with him against the King and his princes.

Another letter to the Pope on the same subject ends thus :—

May your Holiness fare well and be strong ; and may it please you ere long to condescend to my relief, that I, *whose life is a death*, may at least live.*

In a letter to Conrad, Archbishop of Mayence, our Saint

* Froude, p. 360.

speaks of the sharpness of this fresh trial of the suspension of his legatine powers.

At present the King of England is causing my suspension to be cried through the streets of both kingdoms, and in witness of my overthrow, is exhibiting the Apostolic Letters to make me odious and wearisome in the sight of men. He boasts that the term granted him lasts till he pleases to receive me into favour, which, if he is allowed, he will put off till the Greek Kalends, i.e. for ever.

It was on the 9th of October, 1166, that the Holy Father had appointed S. Thomas his Legate over England; and in May, 1168, these powers had been suspended until the following Lent, when they were to be restored if the King did not come to terms earlier.

At the period of which we are about to speak, S. Thomas's suspension was ended, and the King felt that the ecclesiastical sword was again in his opponent's hands, and hung over his head by a single hair. Letters actually empowering S. Thomas to lay Henry's kingdom under an interdict had been forwarded to the Saint in case of the King's persisting longer in his refusal to submit to terms. This it seems to have been, and a design to get S. Thomas once more into his power, and no real desire for a reconciliation with one whom he had come to regard with the bitterest hatred, which was the cause of his interview and pretended reconciliation with the Saint at Freitalv.* It would take us far beyond the limits of this article, already longer than we had proposed, were we to enter into the interesting accounts of these interviews between Henry and his exile, or the struggles of the Archbishop to bring those of his suffragans who so shamefully and unnaturally opposed him, back to their duty. Roger de Pont l'Evêque, Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of London and Salisbury, were amongst the foremost of those who tried their uttermost to ruin the Saint, both at Rome

* That Henry had some sinister design in this last conference can hardly be doubted by those who read the account of it. The Archbishop's party were quite surprised at this sudden desire for peace on the part of a monarch who had been so inexorable for nearly seven years, and plainly the Archbishop himself was filled with misgivings after the interview was over. One of his historians tells us that some one in the King's interest had hinted to Henry that it was a mistake to keep the Archbishop out of the country, "as he would be far better in than out." But first, continues the historian, he caused his son to be crowned with despatch, on account of a certain result which might possibly take place; so that if a crime were committed the kingdom could not be punished on his account, seeing that he would no longer be king of it.

and with the King, and who rebelled most openly against his authority ; and of these the Bishop of London was, as we have seen, the most prominent throughout the whole contest. The coronation of the young Prince Henry by the Archbishop of York, at the King's command, had put the finishing stroke to the series of contumacious acts of these bishops, whose whole course had been insult and disobedience to their spiritual chief. For the coronation of the King of England was one of the undoubted prerogatives of the See of Canterbury ; and when S. Thomas, who saw what was about to happen, sent letters obtained from Rome, forbidding any one but the Archbishop of Canterbury to perform the ceremony, they were utterly disregarded by the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London, to whom they were delivered.

It was now six long weary years that S. Thomas had passed in exile, and endured in addition to all his other trials that hope long deferred which maketh the heart sick. The last interview with the King near the Castle of Freitval, when King Henry made a show of reconciliation and restitution, decided S. Thomas to return to his desolate See and Church.

Many were the misgivings of the Saint's friends at his resolution of returning into the power of a king who had shown himself so wily, so treacherous, and so implacable a foe. None of them believed in Henry's seeming reconciliation, and the King himself still refused to give the Saint the kiss of peace at mass. When S. Thomas wrote to Rome to inform the Pope and his court of the apparent peace of Freitval, Cardinal Albert observed, "The Ethiopian does not easily change his skin, or the leopard his spots." The Saint himself, on going to say farewell to his kind friend the King of France, said, "We are going to England to play at heads." "So it seems to me," replied the King ; and then he urged the Saint never to trust himself in King Henry's dominions so long as that prince refused to give him the kiss of peace. "Remain," he said, "and as long as King Louis lives, the wine, the food, and the wealth of France shall never fail you." But S. Thomas knew that his Master's Will was otherwise, and that his hour was at hand. He replied, with tears, to his generous friend, "God's Will be done ;" and with a like emotion on the part of the King of France, they parted. To the Bishop of Paris our Saint also spoke prophetically of the event of his return. "I am going to England," he said, "to die." He took leave of King Henry, saying that his heart warned him that the King would never see him alive again.

The King's intention seems to have been clear enough to

his ministers and to the barons of his court. From the varied evidence on the subject, it seems manifest that the speech of the King, which caused the final catastrophe, was rather the expression of impatience at the delay of those who knew his wishes, in executing them, than any sudden ebullition of anger which conveyed no grave intention, as some historians have intimated. Reginald de Warenne told the canons of the Southwark Chapter, who were great friends of his, that he hoped they would pray for him, for that he had great need of it. Soon, he said, something would be done in England, such as had never before been heard of, but that it was against his (De Warenne's) will, he not being his own master.

In concluding his affairs, to return to his diocese, S. Thomas wrote two letters, one to the Pope and another to the King of England. In the former he employs all his influence with the Holy Father to induce him to use the weapons of the Church with such gentleness and forbearance towards her adversaries, as may leave no plea for breaking the supposed peace. "That he [the Pope] should write to the King, tenderly, and explain how that the Lord hath established the Apostolical See, &c." He entreated the Holy Father that the Bishop of London's sedition—not to call it schism—might be pardoned, as well as the Bishop of Salisbury's, and the excommunication of the other bishops (excepting the Archbishop of York) left to his (S. Thomas's) discretion: promising to use the same with a view to God's honour and the Pope's. In all which we see how beautifully the Saint mingled forbearance, tenderness, and compassion towards his enemies with his ardent zeal and enthusiasm for the cause and honour of God.*

His letter to the King, while evincing the same spirit, shows what real grounds he had for mistrusting that deceitful and treacherous monarch.†

Christ, the Inspector of hearts, knoweth with what sincere intentions we made peace with you, trusting to a like good faith on your Highness's part towards ourselves. For what less, my lord, could we expect after those arguments and words of consolation which your Highness's benignity addressed to us? Your letters, also, to our lord the King, your son, touching the resti-

* Note from Canon Morris, p. 294.—It subsequently transpired that one of the serjeants of the King's court had with his own hands sealed the letters which were sent to England to command the death of the Archbishop; Nigel de Sacville having written them. And he added that he had confessed this to an English bishop and asked for a penance; but the bishop had said, "What for? You did your lord's command," and, as if he had done no harm, enjoined him nothing.

† Froude, p. 525.

tution to us and ours of the possessions which we held before our departure, what other profession did they make but that of benevolence and peace? But now, more to your own dishonour than to our disadvantage (God knoweth how sincerely we think so), manifestations are being made the very opposite of sincerity and good faith. For the councillors of our lord the King, your son (who these are, and how far they are to be trusted is for your lordship to inquire), have now, on pretence of summoning Randolph (de Broc), put off the making restitution. The Church, your honour, and your soul must suffer from such proceedings, unless you speedily correct them. Meantime, the said Randolph violently outrages the property of the Church, collects our stores into the Castle of Saltwode, and, as we have been informed by those who can prove it, has in the hearing of many boasted that we shall not long enjoy our peace, "for that before we have eaten a loaf of bread in England he will take away our life."

Your Highness knows that voluntarily to overlook a wrong is to participate in the guilt. Yet is this Randolph plainly relying on your countenance and authority, for how else could he venture so far? What was the answer he returned to your son's letters? We leave this for your discretion to reflect upon when you are informed of it.

Forasmuch, however, as there are plain indications that, through hatred of our person, the Mother of the British Churches is in danger of perishing, we, in order to save her from this fate, are prepared, God willing, to surrender our life into the hands of Randolph and his accomplices in persecution; yea, and to die a thousand deaths for Christ's sake, if His grace enable us.

I had intended, my lord, ere now, to have returned to you; but the necessities of the afflicted Church draw me to her side. With your favour and permission I purpose returning to her, perhaps, unless your timely pity ordain it otherwise, to die for her.

Yours, whether we live or die, now and ever in the Lord.

John of Salisbury also wrote a letter to his friend, the Abbot of S. Remy,* showing too plainly the hollow character of Henry's seeming reconciliation and the ruinous condition of the Archbishop's possessions. We trust we shall be forgiven for inserting it at full length, as a beautiful specimen of the devoted loyalty of S. Thomas's friends, and the pure and fervent faith and piety of many of the devout priests and others of that period.

JOHN OF SALISBURY TO PETER, ABBOT OF S. REMY.

You might well accuse my delay if I had not necessity to excuse it. I ought, when I first set foot in England, to have sent back a messenger to certify your goodness of the state of your children. Yet, so entirely new and strange was the whole face of affairs which met me on leaving the vessel, that my own utter uncertainty ill qualified me for certifying another.

* Froude, p. 527.

Three days before I landed, a mark had been set on all the effects of his Lordship of Canterbury ; and his proctors had been excluded from all share in administering them. Also an edict had been published in all the ports, forbidding, under penalty of exile and proscription, that any of our party should leave England.

Such has been the pious circumspection of the King's officers, that the Archbishop and his friends, on their return from exile, have little to find except empty and dismantled houses, dilapidated barns, and naked threshing-floors : this is their consolation for their long proscription, the amends made them for the sacrilege of which they have been the victims. And, whereas our peace had been made on the feast of S. Magdalene, and our most serene lord the King had instructed his son, by his letters patent, that all things were to be restored to the Archbishop and his, entire as they had been before he left England, yet all the revenues which will become due up to Christmas have been already seized in the King's name. Moreover, many churches and possessions, which by right and by the terms of our covenant, should have been restored to the See of Canterbury, are still in the occupation of laymen, under State authority. I, among others, have been deprived of a church which brought my predecessor 40 marks a year.

It happened that I landed three days before the octave of S. Martin ; on the octave a synod was to be held at Canterbury, in which I had to supply the vacant place of the Archbishop ; so when I found, contrary to my hopes and expectations, and to the King's promises, that the Archbishop's restoration was altogether despaired of, and that I myself was in a manner under arrest, I set out for Canterbury with as cheerful a countenance and as quiet a mind as I could summon. There I was received, both by clergy and people, with great honour and, as it were, an angel of the Lord.

From my return the faithful seemed to have conceived better hopes, as they felt sure that the Archbishop would never have sent me forward unless he was himself on the point to follow. When the synod was concluded, I set out to present myself before the young king. He received me graciously enough ; but those about him intimated that all was not safe : they suspected that peace had not been made with us in sincerity ; and that the rancour, which had been nominally softened, was in reality more firmly fixed than ever. I myself saw too many signs of this, but conducted myself as if all was going on according to my wishes. From hence I made my way in all haste to my mother : she was languishing on another year, and, since she saw me, is now expecting the day of the Lord with joy. I commend her earnestly to your prayers, and to those of the Saints with whom you dwell. She had received an answer from the Spirit that she should not taste death till she had seen me and my brother return from exile.

Such was the state of things on the eve of the Saint's return to Canterbury after his long exile. Pope Alexander meanwhile had not entirely conceded to S. Thomas's tenderness towards his foes all for which it had pleaded. The length of the struggle, the bitterness and animosity of the King and those of the clergy who sided with him, demon-

strated more and more forcibly to the Roman Court the spirit by which they were animated, and the hopelessness of coming to terms with them. On the other hand, the ever-increasing saintliness of the Archbishop, his deep and prolonged sufferings, and the exalted dignity, firmness, and greatness of soul with which he placed his cause in the hands of his Lord and prepared to return and abide the result, was evidence to the Pope that the cause of the Church must be strengthened in his person if it were to prevail. Alexander therefore forwarded to S. Thomas letters, suspending the Archbishop of York and the other bishops (excepting Exeter) who were participants in the coronation of the young king, and excommunicating the Bishops of London and Salisbury. These were intrusted by the Primate to faithful messengers, and sent on to England before him. The one for the Archbishop of York was given to a nun named Idonea to deliver; who, with the devotion shown by her sex even from the times of the Apostles, fulfilled a mission fraught with danger, for the love of God and veneration for His servant.

These three bishops, having had intimation of the arms which the Primate was bringing against them, repaired to the coast with Randolph de Broc and a party of his soldiers, intending to seize the Primate and take the letters of excommunication from him by force. Some have even said that they proposed to countenance his massacre by the soldiers. Instead of meeting S. Thomas, however, they met his messengers, who thus caught them in their own snare, and served the letters of excommunication upon them.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of England—for now that he is about to return to his Church we must give him his full titles—embarked from Wysand or Ouessant, in the territory of Boulogne, on a Tuesday, that day of the week which had been marked by all the chief events of his life, the 1st of December, 1170. He set out, accompanied by—or rather, as Lingard says, in the custody of—one of the chiefs of his old enemies, John of Oxford, whom the King sent as his delegate, and by his own followers. As they stood on the sea-shore, the sea and sky calm and serene and the ship in readiness, the Archbishop paused and gazed at the scene before him. Perhaps his soul, permitted by his Lord so clear a vision of his approaching martyrdom, was lifting itself to that Lord whence came his help, for strength to walk forward to meet the bloody death which awaited him. Some of his clergy and co-exiles said, with the natural and passionate longing for their native land, so long sighed for and now almost in view before them, “My lord, look, we can see England !

Why do you hesitate, and, gazing like Moses upon the land of promise, behold, yet enter it not?" The Archbishop turned to them: "You hasten now," he said. "Not forty days hence, and you will rather be in any corner of the earth than in England."

The Primate and his suite were pursued with warnings to the very water's edge. The Earl of Boulogne sent to them a messenger: "Beware," he said to the Archbishop; "the ports are beset with men who seek your life; who, as soon as you leave the vessel, will either murder you or deprive you of your liberty." But the Archbishop replied: "Did you tell me I were to be torn limb from limb, I would not regard it; for I am resolved that nothing shall hinder my return. Seven years are long enough for a pastor to have been absent from the Lord's sorrowing flock; I will only ask my friends (and a *last* request *should* be attended to) that if I cannot return to my Church alive, they will carry me into it dead." The crew of an English vessel almost at the same time urged the Archbishop's followers not to go forward into England, where they declared destruction awaited them, and spoke of the excitement caused by the recent suspensions. But the Archbishop's resolution was fixed. "In England I am resolved to be," he said; "I am aware of the consequences."

For greater security, and not to neglect all wise human precautions, the Archbishop landed at Sandwich, which was one of his own ports. His return was the signal for general joy. At Sandwich the people watched for his vessel; and when they saw the Archiepiscopal cross, which marked it from the others, they rushed into the water to receive him. The road to Canterbury was thronged with people, especially the poor, whose friend he had ever so truly been, invoking the blessing of Heaven upon him—"Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord;"—and the clergy, with crucifixes before them, led out their parishioners to meet him. At Canterbury the enthusiasm increased. The inhabitants decked out the cathedral, rang the bells, and, arraying themselves in silks and holiday dresses, prepared a public entertainment. "The churches," says Fitzstephen, "resounded with chants and anthems, and the halls with trumpets, and the rejoicing was general."

The triumph of the Archbishop was thus far complete. While abroad in exile, his noble conduct and long suffering for the cause of God had drawn down the blessings of the French people as he passed along the roads, after meeting his persecutor; and now he was amongst his own countrymen, by whom he had ever been beloved, and who had come to

regard him as a saint and confessor for their Church and her rights.

The Primate went straight to his cathedral, and walked up to the episcopal throne, receiving there the religious to the kiss of peace. His face was remarked to shine with a supernatural splendour, and the people all round him wept with joy. His faithful Herbert said to him: "My Lord, we do not now mind when you may have to leave the world, for the Church, Christ's Spouse, has this day conquered in you." To which words the Archbishop only replied by looking at his friend.

The Saint preached in the chapter-house an impressive sermon, on a text most suitable indeed to his own circumstances: "We have here no abiding city, but seek one to come."

Meantime the suspended prelates sent their chaplains with the soldiers, to the Primate, to desire absolution from the censures; saying that he had not come in peace, but in sword and in fire, trampling on his fellow-bishops, and making them as the sole of his feet, uncited, unheard, unjudged; that his suffragans had gone to sea to meet him, but that they had unexpectedly found themselves dressed in certain black garments, of which, if his lordship pleased, they must be ridded before they should present themselves. In his answer he said that "there was no true peace except to men of good will: Jerusalem, abounding in luxury and self-indulgence, said to herself, it is peace; but the Lord wept over it, because the vengeance of God hung over it and was hid from its eyes." Their sentence, he reminded them, was passed by the Pope, nor was it for them to call in question his Holiness's acts. On their pressing him very earnestly, however, for the absolution, S. Thomas, for the sake of peace, promised to accept their oath to obey the judgment of the Pope, and to do what he could for them after consulting the King and the other bishops, subject always to the Pope's approbation. But the bishops rejected this offer as an insult to the Crown, and sent their emissaries on to the King on the Continent to take further measures of rebellious opposition.

After about a week passed in his diocesan city, S. Thomas sent messengers to the young king to announce his intention of waiting upon him. He had brought over with him for this prince a present of three magnificent horses, with embroidered trappings ornamented with flowers, "for he regarded him with great kindness," says the old historian,* "having brought him up as a boy."

* Fitzstephen.

On his way to London the Bishop of Rochester, brother of the late Archbishop Theobald, met him with a procession of his clergy; and as he entered the City another procession conducted him to the Church of St. Mary's, Southwark. The poor scholars and clerics of London went out to meet him, and while they made the air resound with the *Te Deum*, the people shed tears of joy. S. Thomas bowed his head in gratitude, scattering alms around. The Southwark canons received him at the door of S. Mary's, singing the *Benedictus*, and he was lodged in the Bishop of Winchester's palace. But in the midst of these rejoicings a crazy woman named Matilda repeatedly cried out, "Archbishop, beware of the knife!"

The next day S. Thomas received a peremptory message from the young king, ordering him back at once to Canterbury. He asked in vain for an explanation, but was excluded from the royal presence. This fresh blow from his former youthful friend and pupil seems to have struck the Saint's heart, so tender in its friendships, affections, and memories, and to have filled him with the worst forebodings. For we find him on the 13th of December, the feast of S. Lucy, at his manor of Harrow, receiving a visit from his friend the Abbot of S. Alban's, for whom he had sent, saying that never had he so much needed consolation as then. When he had detailed the events of the last sad years of exile, the Abbot said to him, "By God's grace, that is now all happily ended"; but the Saint replied, sighing, and pressing the Abbot's hand, "My friend, my friend, I will tell you my case as to another self. Things are very different with me to what men think. New persecutions are beginning. The King and his son, who is my only hope, are devising fresh injuries." "How can this be, holy Father?" said the Abbot. The Saint looked up to Heaven, and, with a deep sigh, he added, "Well enough, well enough I know to what matters are tending." They parted, the Saint enjoining the Abbot to invoke for him his patron, S. Thomas Apostle and Martyr.

Although S. Thomas in returning to Canterbury was only accompanied by five soldiers, a guard absolutely necessary in those times against marauders, it was reported to King Henry that he was marching about England with a large army in helmets and coats of mail, besieging towns and intending to drive the young king out of the country. On arriving at Canterbury he dismissed his escort.

On his road home, at Wrotham, he fell in with a poor priest named William, who, begging a private audience, said that he had brought the Archbishop some relics of S. Lawrence, S. Vincent, and S. Cecilia, as S. Lawrence had told him to do

in a vision. S. Thomas asked him how he knew that they were the relics of those Saints. The priest replied, "My Lord, in my vision I asked St. Lawrence for some sign ; for I said that otherwise you would not believe me. And S. Lawrence told me that you lately put your hand into your breast and found the hair shirt torn which you wear next your skin, and while you were deliberating whether you should have it repaired or a new one made, you put your hand in again and found it whole." The Saint, on hearing this, charged the priest, in virtue of obedience, to tell no one as long as he (S. Thomas) lived. The priest promised, and begged of his patron to think of him, who was a poor man serving in another man's church. One of the last recorded acts of the Saint's life was to make out a deed giving this poor cleric the chapel of Pensehurst, and subjoining an anathema to any one who dared to deprive him of it.

Meantime the infamous family of the de Brocs neglected no opportunity of insulting and injuring the Primate and his dependents. From the Castle of Saltwode, which they had robbed from his See, they cut off the Archbishop's stores as they arrived by sea, killed the deer in his chase, stole his dogs, and on Christmas-eve Robert de Broc, an apostate monk, waylaid a train of the Archbishop's pack-horses, and cut off the tail of one of them as a special insult.

The letter of John of Salisbury to the Abbot of S. Remy, which we have already quoted, describes the grievous position of the Saint and his friends at this period. "No way seems now open for our consolation and safety," he says, "unless the prayers of yourself and the Saints can deliver us from the snares of those who would wipe us utterly away from the earth ; yet though the persecution is most grievous, and few among the rich and honourable come near the Archbishop, he himself with the dignity of a bishop does justice for all that come near to him, laying aside all consideration of persons." On Christmas-night, the Archbishop sang the Gospel of the Nativity after Matins, as is still the usage of the Benedictine order, and celebrated the midnight Mass himself. He sang the High Mass on Christmas-day and preached on the text, "On earth peace to men of good will." His eloquence and enthusiasm increased with the occasion, and reached its height as he spoke of the Holy Fathers of the Church of Canterbury, the confessors who were there. "One Archbishop and Martyr they had had already," he said—"S. Elphege, murdered by the Danes ; it was possible they might have another soon." The tears burst from his eyes ; his sobs interrupted his words, and his emotion arose to

anguish. The soul which had toiled, and suffered, and agonized for His sake, was likened to its Lord at last ; it was the martyrdom of the spirit, the cry of a heart crucified and broken with the love of God.

The people around him wept and groaned in passionate sorrow ; "Father," they cried, "why do you desert us so soon ? To whom do you leave us desolate ?" Putting a strong restraint on his tears, the Saint with clear and authoritative voice pronounced excommunication against Robert de Broc, as he had forewarned that obstinate offender, whom he had summoned to do penance, and who had returned for answer that if he were excommunicate he would act as such. In the same sentence were included the usurpers of S. Thomas's two churches of Harrow and Thierwood.

On the two following feasts, S. Stephen and S. John, the Saint sang Mass, and on the latter day S. Thomas received a letter warning him of his impending fate. One of the citizens of Canterbury also, known to S. Thomas, warned him that the murderers had landed in England, and were advancing for his destruction. But the Saint, who knew already that the hour of his martyrdom was approaching, only replied with tears, "I know, my son, that I shall die a violent death ; but they will not kill me outside my church." On the feast of S. Stephen, the Saint sent off his cross-bearer Alexander, and another of his suite, to bear a letter to the Holy Father, and his chaplain Herbert to the King and some of his friends in France. It was the last letter he ever wrote to the Pope. After describing his return to his diocese, the grievous position he found himself in, and the dangers which surrounded him, he mentions the departure of the three bishops to King Henry's court in France for their uncanonical purposes, on that evil expedition which was in fact the moving cause of his martyrdom. These persons, he said, dreaded nothing so much as the peace of the Church, lest its discipline should interfere with their irregularities. The letter ends, "May your Holiness fare well for ever, dearest father."

The excommunicated bishops crossed the sea, and repaired to the King at his palace of Bur, near Bayeux, and there detailed to him, with many exaggerations and false statements, their tale of grievances ; not forgetting to enlarge on the Archbishop's *armed progresses*, as they called the peaceful processions of his clergy. Although Henry appears to have affected to authorize S. Thomas to punish the injuries to his Church, and already knew of the excommunications, he pretended to be ignorant of them. "By God's eyes," said the King, "if all who were concerned in my son's coronation are to be excom-

municated, I will be excommunicated too." He then asked what they would advise him to do? Roger of York replied: "It is not for us to advise your Highness, your barons will do that;" "but," added one of them, "My Lord, while Thomas lives you will not have peace or quiet, or see another good day." Upon this the King burst into one of his violent fits of rage; his eyes flashed fire, and his whole face was distorted, resembling the unhappy spirit that animated it. "What slothful wretches have I maintained in my court," he exclaimed; "not one will deliver me from this low-born cleric." And thus saying, he left the council-chamber.

Four barons, continues the old chronicle,—Reginald Fitzurse, William de Traci, Hugh de Moreville, and Richard de Bryto—left the court, and crossed the Channel from different ports, and by the guidance of the devil, the ancient enemy of all good, assembled all at the same hour at Saltwode, the castle of the de Brocs. The King called a council of his barons, whose observations and advice showed them to have been proper courtiers to such a monarch.

Engelgere de Bohun, an excommunicate, said of the Saint, "I do not know what you are to do with such a fellow, except you bind him with a wicker rope, and hang him on a cross." William Malvoisin observed that he had heard, when at Rome, that a certain Pope had been killed on account of his intolerable haughtiness and insolence.

The King then sent some knights after those who had left, as it was reported, to seize the Archbishop. The ports were all guarded, and orders sent for household troops to repair privately to Canterbury.

On the Monday, the feast of the Holy Innocents, the four murderers held their council at Saltwode; and on Tuesday, with their retainers, and the whole de Broc family, and soldiers gathered from the neighbouring castles, they rode forward to Canterbury.

Meantime, our Saint had been preparing himself with fervent devotion for the death which he knew was rapidly coming upon him. He had recited Matins with his clerics and monks at midnight of the Holy Innocents; and when they were finished, he opened a window and stood for a long time in silence looking out into the night. Then, as if human nature seemed to arise for a moment and urge him to avoid a bloody death, he suddenly turned and asked those near him what time it was, and whether it would be possible to reach Sandwich before daybreak? They replied that a much further distance might be gained, as it was yet quite early, and that place was but seven miles off. If, however, any such

power of the flesh oppressed the spirit, it was but for a moment; for he quickly murmured to himself, "God's will be done in me! Thomas will wait for whatever God has in store for him in the church over which he presides."

The Tuesday dawned, the 29th of December, 1170—that day which was to be honoured throughout Christendom in future ages as sacred to one of the Church's greatest saints and martyrs. S. Thomas assisted at the Cathedral Mass, and remained in spiritual conference for two hours in the chapter-house with two of the monks most noted for their piety. He made his confession with deepest marks of contrition, and received the discipline three times on that day of preparation for joining the saints in heaven; and when afterwards his cheerfulness at table was remarked upon by one of his religious, he replied: "A man must be cheerful who is going to his Master."

The Archbishop and his monks and clerics had dined, and grace having been chanted, they retired into the Archbishop's room, where he sat upon the bed, with his friends reclining around him at his feet. There seem to have been present John of Salisbury, William Fitzstephen, Robert Prior of Merton, Edward Grim, a young cleric from Cambridge, and several religious. The servants and attendants were still at dinner in the hall, as was the custom after their superiors had left, and the doors were yet open which admitted the crowd of poor daily relieved from the Saint's table, when the four knights, with an attendant archer, entered the hall. They rejected the offers of refreshment made to them by the Saint's attendants, and passed on to the foot of the staircase which led to the Archbishop's room. There they met his Seneschal, William Fitznigel, who recognized them as courtiers, and at their request led the way to the room in which the Saint and his friends were. "My lord," he said, "here are four knights from the King wishing to speak with you." "Let them come in," S. Thomas replied, continuing his conversation with the religious next him, and on whose shoulder he was leaning, without looking towards his sudden guests. They gave no attention to the Archbishop, but sat down amongst the clerics at his feet, with Radulf, their archer, behind them.

S. Thomas then turned round and saluted William de Traci by name. Of this salutation, however, the knights took no notice, but gazed on each other in silence; until at length Fitzurse said scornfully, "God help you!" The colour rushed into the Saint's face; but he kept silence, while the knights still glared fiercely at him and at each other. Fitzurse continued, "We have commands for you from the

King over the water ; say if you will hear them privately or in the hearing of all." "As you wish," replied S. Thomas. "No ; as you wish," said Fitzurse. Finally, the room being cleared, Fitzurse began to speak about the absolution of the bishops ; when the Saint ordered the clergy to return, saying that these things ought not to be told in secret.

The murderers afterwards confessed that during the few moments they were then left alone with the Archbishop, they had thought of killing him with his archiepiscopal cross, no other weapon being at hand.

On the return of the clerics, S. Thomas said, "Now, you may tell your lord's will in their presence." Fitzurse then said, as the Archbishop had chosen to make these things public instead of private, he would satisfy him and tell the matters before all present. He then represented that the King said that he had made peace in good faith, but that the Archbishop had violated his engagements, gone about Henry's kingdom with armed bands, and excommunicated the Archbishop of York and others for crowning the young king ; and that the King called upon him to wait upon his son at Winton, and make amends for his treason and swear fealty, and further ordered him to absolve the bishops. The Archbishop asked, "What treason ? and for what was he to swear fealty ?" He said that he had already tried to see the young king and had been refused ; that he was ready to do fealty for his barony, which he held of the King ; but that as to the excommunications and suspensions, they were done by the Pope ; and he added, that although he was not sorry that the offence against his Church had been punished, he had already offered to absolve his suffragans, the Bishops of London and Salisbury, on their submission and oath to obey the judgment of the Pope, but that they had refused. And as to his treason, he said he would, far from uncrowning the young king, rejoice to give him three crowns and more dominions. Fitzurse then spoke yet more insolently ; the Archbishop, he said, was accusing the King of deepest treachery in acquiescing in the punishment of bishops who had but obeyed his orders. "Yours is an awful crime," he said, "in feigning such treachery of our lord the King." "Reginald, Reginald," said the Saint, "I do not accuse the King of treachery. Our reconciliation was not so secretly done ; but I appeal to the archbishops, bishops, men of rank, religious, and more than five hundred knights who were there and heard it, and yourself, Sir Reginald, who were present. Fitzurse swore that he was not present. The Saint re-

plied, "God knows it, for I am certain that I saw you there." The knights then became more excited: they swore by God's wounds that they had borne with him too long, and, as the King's liegemen, would bear with him no longer; and then, as if resolved to find some more distinct pretext for their meditated violence, they asked him from whom he held his archbishopric. The Archbishop replied, "Its spiritualities from God and my lord the Pope, and its temporalities from the King." "Own," said they, "that you have it all from the King." S. Thomas replied, "By no means; for we are commanded to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Upon this they gnashed upon him with their teeth. He added that since he came to England under the King's safe-conduct, he had been threatened, insulted, and injured, which was hard measure. De Moreville here asked why, if injured, he had not complained to the King, instead of excommunicating the offenders on his own authority. To which he replied, "Hugh, how you lift up your head! If the rights of the Church are injured, I shall wait for no man's leave to do justice."

Upon this the knights cast off all restraint; they glared upon the Saint like wild beasts, leapt upon their feet, twisted their long gloves wildly, threw up their arms, and gnashed their teeth with fury. "Threats! threats!" they said; "is he going to excommunicate us all? God be merciful to us; he shall not do it; he has excommunicated too many already!"

The Archbishop turned to them with dignity; "My lords," he said, "you threaten me in vain. If all the swords in England were pointed at me, your terrors could not move me from the observance of God's justice and allegiance to our Lord the Pope. I know that you have come here to kill me, but I make God my shield. Foot to foot you will find me in the battle of the Lord. I fled from my duty once, but will do so no more for ever. Moreover," he added, "I wonder the more at your conduct, considering what there is between you and me." This was in allusion to the fealty which Fitzurse, Traci, and Moreville had sworn to him when Chancellor. They shouted, "There is nothing between us against the King; we can do no more than threaten the Archbishop—let us go."

A number of the Archbishop's household, alarmed at the loud conversation, were now collected, both clerics and men-at-arms; to whom Fitzurse turned, and charged them as the King's liegemen, to keep "this man" in safe custody. The Archbishop said that would be easy, for he should not

go away. "I shall not fly," he said, "for the King or any living man;" and, following the knights to the door, he struck his hand on the very spot of his death-wound, saying, "Here, here you will find me."

John of Salisbury now reproached him with following the knights to the door, which he said had made them more angry; that he should rather have called his Council and given them a milder answer. S. Thomas replied that counsel was already taken, and he knew what he ought to do. "We must all die," he said, "and the fear of men must not turn us from justice. I am more ready to die," he added, "for God and the liberty of His Church, than they are to inflict death upon me."

The knights, who had entered the Archbishop's room with their capes and tunics on over their coats of mail, had gone out to take these garments off, and arm themselves for their deed of violence. Some of the Archbishop's people and others, who saw this and had heard the soldiers ordered to the palace, rushed into the Saint's presence, exclaiming, "My lord, they are arming." But they could not disturb the Saint, who said calmly, "Let them arm." The clerics and religious, however, desiring that he should take sanctuary, urged him to go into the church. After withholding for a little what he called the timidity of the monks, he consented to go and assist at vespers, which had begun. Desiring, therefore, his cross to be borne before him, he walked down the long passages and cloisters into the cathedral, calming by his self-possession the panic fears of his companions.

The monks in choir, disturbed and thrown into confusion by the alarm of some of those who had rushed forward into the church in terror, began some to pray, and some to fly towards the Archbishop as he entered, who they almost feared was already killed. He desired them to return and proceed with the office. But when they would have closed the doors of the cathedral, he commanded them to be opened, saying, "A church must not be closed as a fortress. Suffer all that will to enter the house of God."

Meanwhile, the murderers had sought the Archbishop in his palace; and not finding him, they marched towards the cathedral, breaking down such doors or barriers as intercepted their course. It was nearly five o'clock in the evening, in the very depth of winter, and the days at their shortest. The clerics who surrounded the Archbishop, after urging him to avail himself of the twilight and seek concealment in the many accessible hiding-places in the cathedral, fled away for this purpose themselves, all except Edward Grim. But the

true shepherd giveth his life for his sheep, and the Archbishop refused to fly. "Leave hold of me," said he to his terrified followers, "and go away; there is nothing for you to do here; let God dispose of me as He will."

The Saint and his companions had reached the north transept of the cathedral which enclosed altars to our Lady, to S. Blaise, martyr, and to S. Benedict. Here the murderers overtook them, and cried out, "Where is Thomas, traitor to the King?" To this the Saint made no reply. Fitzurse then said, "Where is the Archbishop?" S. Thomas turned, and advanced, replying, "Here I am, the Archbishop, but no traitor." Then one of them struck him between the shoulders with the flat of his sword. "Fly," said he, "or you are a dead man." The Saint replied, "I will not fly." "Absolve the bishops whom you have excommunicated!" they cried. He answered, "I will do nothing more than I have already said and done." S. Thomas then said to Fitzurse, "Reginald, I have done you many favours, do you come against me in arms?" "You shall know it," replied Fitzurse; "are you not a traitor?" S. Thomas replied, "I do not fear your threats, for I am prepared to die for God; but I charge you by His authority that you touch none of mine." They then tried to drag him out of the church; but he resisted, and stood firm, Edward Grim aiding him; and he exerting his strength, nearly flung Fitzurse on the pavement, while he pronounced judgment upon him for the immorality of his life. "Promoter of wickedness," he said, "you are my man, and shall not touch me; you owe me fealty and submission." "I owe you neither," said the knight, "contrary to my fealty to the King."

Fitzurse then pressed upon him. "Ferez! ferez!" he said (strike, strike), and waved his sword for the first blow. The Saint saw it coming, joined his hands, and covered his eyes with them, bowing his head. "I commend myself to God, Holy Mary, S. Denys, and S. Elphege," he said. The blow fell, and Edward Grim, raising his arm to intercept it, nearly lost his limb, while the Saint's head was smitten on the tonsure. He wiped away the blood which was streaming from his brow, giving thanks to God, and saying, "Into Thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit." A second blow made him fall on his knees, and then on his face, his hands still joined, and stretched out to God, before the altar of S. Benedict. There he breathed out his last words, "For the name of Jesus and the defence of the Church I am ready to die." Even thus he was struck again by the sword of Richard de Bryto with such violence that the sword broke on the pave-

ment. This wretched nobleman added as he dealt the blow, "Take that for the love of my lord William, the King's brother," alluding to an iniquitous marriage between the latter and the Countess de Warenne, which S. Thomas had prevented. Another of his murderers put his foot on the Saint's neck, and drew out his brains with his sword's point. "Let us go," said he, "the traitor is dead; he will rise no more." They then all marched from the church, shouting as before, "Reaux! Reaux!" (king's men! king's men!)

The corpse of the martyr lay composed and graceful even in death, as of one prostrate in prayer.

His clerics and religious, hearing the clamour cease, came forth from the different parts of the church, and gathered together around the corpse. Weeping with anguish and grief, they placed it on a bier, and then Father Robert of Merton, his confessor, drew aside his vest, and showed his monks the fearful hair shirt which this servant of God had worn to scourge and crucify the flesh, while the spirit had been enduring so long a martyrdom for the cause of his Heavenly Master; at the sight of which they all knelt down, and calling him God's glorious Saint and Martyr, invoked his prayers.

As is usually the case at the death of Saints, proofs of his sanctity, unsuspected during his life, came to light. Not only were the marks of the severe discipline he took visible on his body, but his hair shirt, itself unknown to those about him, was filled with vermin, which must have caused constant and terrible suffering to his skin.

It was the Divine Will, too, that the miracles which were wrought by his relics, and on the places that his body had touched, should follow his martyrdom with special promptitude, so as to leave no time to doubt the fact of the sanctity of him who had died for his Lord. And the miracles occurred in such numbers, and with such perfect evidence, as to silence even the mouths of his enemies, who would fain have concealed or thrown discredit upon them.

Much might now be added to show that there was no real evidence of repentance on the part of King Henry for the crime in which he had so large a share; but our space warns us to be brief.

In drawing to a close this sketch of the Saint which we have attempted, it may be well to say a few words on the early friendship between S. Thomas and King Henry, which ended in such complete estrangement. It has not unfrequently excited the surprise of those who have read their history, that two men, bound together apparently by ties

of such close friendship and affection, and who pursued, as it appears, for so many years the same ends, should so suddenly separate, and each embrace a course which led to such entire opposition, and, on the King's part, to such deep hatred. Yet to any one who follows their career with the eye of faith, the whole history of these two men is but the natural development and contrast of one who was ever at heart the disciple of Christ, and another who was with equal sincerity the votary of the world. Both of them were men of great abilities, prompt, vigorous, and energetic in action; both naturally of passionate temperament and strong feelings; both also had high and ambitious views and great aims. With these similarities in their natural character, it was surely not wonderful that in the beginning of their intimacy, and while the King was yet young, they should understand each other better than those about them; that the King should value a man so fitted to do justice to the grandeur of his ideas, and that the Chancellor should feel an affection and devotion to a sovereign so well able to appreciate his abilities. And the generous soul of S. Thomas,—which seemed to take pleasure in the splendour by which he was surrounded, more because it enhanced his master's honour than for its worth to himself,—was peculiarly attractive to Henry's pride. "For this monarch," says Lingard, "was careful that his favourites should owe everything to himself, and gloried in the parade of their power and opulence, because they were of his own creation." When, however, the circumstances of their lives changed, and called forth those latent principles which were deep in the hearts of both, they gradually diverged. The King followed his ambition, and making that his leading motive of action, threw his great abilities into obtaining all which that led him to seek, without any check to those qualities of pride, passion, and violence which were his natural characteristics; and, pursuing his worldly aim with as much determination as his Primate pursued the cause of God, he not unnaturally came to hate the man who was the one obstacle to all his wishes.

But in the case of the Primate, under the shadow of the crucifix which was impressed on his heart amidst all his pomp, his high abilities and energetic temperament were employed in the defence of the Church and her liberties; his strong feelings were poured out towards that Sacred Heart which held up an example of perfect love and suffering; and the proud and passionate nature was quelled and subdued into patience and forbearance, even unto the endurance of death itself, for Christ's sake.

Other Saints there have been, perhaps, who have shone more in extraordinary ways and supernatural gifts than S. Thomas of Canterbury; but none, to our idea, has ever more truly embodied the description given by our Lord in the Gospel, of the Good Shepherd, and which the Church has ordained to be read on his feast:—"I am the Good Shepherd. The good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep. But the hireling, and he that is not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth and scattereth the sheep; and the hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling and he hath no care for the sheep. I am the Good Shepherd, and I know mine, and mine know Me. As the Father knoweth Me and I know the Father, and I lay down My life for My sheep."

ART. VII.—S. LEO'S DOGMATIC LETTER.

S. LEONIS MAGNI EPISTOLA AD FLAVIANUM. A.D. 449.

THEOLOGICAL students are well aware that S. Leo's Dogmatic Letter was the chief ecclesiastical instrument used by God for preserving the Church's purity of faith, when first the deadly poison of Eutychianism began to spread.* At all events (which alone is to our present purpose) nothing can be more certain, than that the Holy Pontiff issued it ex cathedrâ. Baronius tells us (A.D. 449, n. xxxix.) that he sent it round to all the Western churches, "as an antidote ready prepared against the poison of this new heresy;"† and the Western bishops wrote to him accordingly, "that they had adopted his Letter as their *symbol of faith*." (Cappellari, c. 15, n. 4.) As to the Eastern bishops, they exclaimed, when assembled at Chalcedon, "he who does not assent to the Epistle of most holy Leo is a heretic." Nor has any Catholic theologian ever dreamed of denying, that S. Leo put forth the Letter in his capacity of Universal Teacher. Gallicans, of course, deny it to be in itself infallible, because they deny that any Pontifical definition is infallible, apart from Episcopal

* "When first it began to spread": because as time went on, these heretics were ever introducing fresh subtleties, which necessitated an even fuller development of Catholic doctrine than is to be found in S. Leo.

† Baronius's words will be found quoted in our last number, p. 112.

assent: but all Gallicans, no less than all Ultramontanes, have admitted that it *is* a true Pontifical definition of faith.

Now a controversy has recently arisen, as our readers are aware, on the tests of an *ex cathedrâ* Pontifical Act; on the conditions which must exist, in order that any given Pontifical declaration should claim the Catholic's interior assent as an infallible decision. The only basis on which such a controversy can proceed, is an examination of those various utterances which indubitably *are ex cathedrâ*. And, since none was ever more indubitably *ex cathedrâ* than S. Leo's Letter, we shall here briefly consider what light is thrown by it on various portions of this controversy. At present the Letter as a whole is not accessible, we believe, except in folios; and we think therefore we shall at all events do service, if we print it in full at the end of this brief article.

Firstly, then, it has sometimes been alleged that no Act is *ex cathedrâ* which is not formally addressed to the Universal Church. This theory is at once refuted by the Letter before us; which is formally addressed to S. Flavian, the then Patriarch of Constantinople.

2. Sometimes however it is not denied, that an *ex cathedrâ* Act may be formally addressed to an individual; but a different distinction is drawn. "At all events," so argue these thinkers, "*the whole contents* of an *ex cathedrâ* Act must be doctrinal" and didactic. But turn e.g. to Gregory XVI.'s 'Mirari vos' or Pius IX.'s Munich Brief, you will find the doctrinal "declarations mixed throughout with references to contemporary persons and events; and this very admixture shows "that the doctrinal declarations themselves are not issued *ex cathedrâ*." Now certainly, neither in the "Mirari vos" nor in the Munich Brief is there so great an admixture of personal reference with the doctrinal declarations, as there is in S. Leo's Letter. In our last number (p. 95) we gave the following analysis of its contents; and as we now print the Letter, our readers may judge for themselves how far our analysis was correct.

The Holy Pontiff begins by expressing his surprise that S. Flavian's letter had been so long in reaching him. Now for the first time, he proceeds to say, he understands what has really taken place in the East; he sees that Eutyches is a foolish and unlearned man, who proudly refuses to learn from others wiser than himself; who does not understand the very elementary dogmata contained in the Symbol. Had he only considered three particular clauses of the Apostles' Creed, he would never have devised his heresy. S. Leo proceeds to explain how these three clauses are really inconsistent with the new heresy; but adds that even if Eutyches had so blinded himself as to be incapable of this obvious reasoning, the words of

Scripture are express against him. The Holy Pontiff is thus led, apparently by the mere natural course of his argument, to state scientifically that portion of Christian dogma which Eutyches assailed, and to confirm it by Scriptural testimonies. He then concludes his letter, by commenting on what had passed between his correspondent S. Flavian and the heresiarch. He expresses wonder that none of the assembled bishops had rebuked the perverse expression of doctrine which the latter had uttered ; and adds that if the heretic repents, he trusts S. Flavian will press him to purge himself from the stain of this false profession. The Pontiff perceives, from the account of facts just received, that Eutyches has been latterly less attached to his heresy than he was at first ; but as he refused to anathematize it, judges S. Flavian to have been quite right in condemning him. Still the heresiarch can be at once joyfully received back if he turns from his error. S. Leo concludes with mentioning by name the legates and the notary, whom he sends to the East with a view of bringing the whole matter to a good conclusion.

3. Others again maintain, that the Pontiff never speaks as Universal Teacher, unless when he singles out this or that *definite proposition* for approval or censure ; that he never speaks as Universal Teacher, in any prolonged and sustained *exposition* of doctrine. Such an opinion is promptly refuted by the most cursory perusal of S. Leo's Letter. This Letter teaches dogma precisely by way of elaborate exposition, and in no other way whatever.

4. Lastly, it has been said that no Act is *ex cathedrâ*, which does not itself express—either directly or equivalently—the obligation of absolute interior assent incumbent on all Catholics. For ourselves, on the contrary, we have uniformly contended that the Supreme Pontiff may authenticate the *ex cathedrâ* character of his Act by *extrinsic marks* ; as e. g. very prominently by *commanding its publication*. Now on *this* question, again, S. Leo's Letter would seem decisive. No one, merely from reading it, would know for certain that the Holy Pontiff is intending to demand the absolute interior assent of all Catholics, to that precise exposition of dogma which he is laying down. Indeed there is far greater appearance of such an intention in many Letters addressed by Pius IX. to individual bishops : e. g. in the Munich Brief and the condemnation of Fröhschammer. But when you find St. Leo circulating this Letter among the various Churches—claiming infallibility for it by his Legates at Chalcedon—accepting with complacency the declaration of Western bishops, that they accept it as their symbol of faith—you cannot possibly doubt (nor has any theologian in fact ever doubted) what authority he really claimed for it. But then (let this be added in passing) the *extrinsic* evidence for the *ex cathedrâ* character of the “*Mirari vos*” is

in every respect still stronger. Intrinsically indeed that Letter was originally addressed, not to one patriarch, but to all the patriarchs and bishops of Christendom. But consider also its extrinsic notes. The very Pope who issued it most expressly declared it to have been *ex cathedrâ*. He declared this, not only in the accompanying Letter, forwarded by his express command to the unhappy man principally condemned—not only in official Letters, subsequently addressed to individual bishops—but in an Encyclical (the “*Singulari nos*”) addressed to the whole Episcopate.

Such are some of the important questions on which S. Leo's Letter is calculated to throw light. But on other grounds altogether, theological students, who have not hitherto given it their attention, may thank us for introducing them to its contents. In no other document perhaps that ever was written, has the great dogma of the Incarnation been at once so accurately and so forcibly set forth. It runs as follows:—

LEO EPISCOPUS DILECTISSIMO FRATRI FLAVIANO
CONSTANTINOPOLITANO EPISCOPO.

Lectis dilectionis tuae litteris, quas miramur fuisse tam seras, et Gestorum Episcopalium ordine recensito: tandem quid apud vos scandali contigerit, atque contra integritatem fidei exortum fuerit, agnovimus, et quæ prius videbantur occulta, nunc nobis reserata patuerunt. Quibus Eutyches, qui presbyterii nomine honorabilis videbatur, multum imprudens et nimis imperitus ostenditur; ut etiam de ipso dictum sit à Prophetâ: “Noluit intelligere ut benè ageret: iniquitatem meditatus est in cubili suo.” Quid autem iniquius, quam impia sapere, et sapientioribus doctioribusque non credere? Sed in hanc insipientiam cadunt, qui cùm ad cognoscendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obscuro, non ad Propheticas voces, non ad Apostolicas litteras, nec ad Evangelicas auctoritates, sed ad semetipsos recurrunt. Et ideo magistri erroris existunt, quia veritatis discipuli non fuere. Quam enim eruditione de sacris novi et veteris Testamenti paginis acquisivit, qui nec ipsius quidem Symboli initia comprehendit? Et quod per totum mundum omnium regeneratorum voce depromitur, istius adhuc senis corde non capitur. Nesciens igitur quid deberet de Verbi Dei Incarnatione sentire, nec volens ad promerendum intelligentia lumen in sanctarum Scripturarum latitudine laborare, illam saltem communem et indiscretam confessionem solito apprehendisset auditu, quâ Fidelium universitas profitetur, credere se in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, et Jesum Christum Filium Ejus, unicum Dominum nostrum, Qui natus est de Spiritu sancto ex Mariâ Virgine: Quibus tribus sententiis omnium fere hereticorum machinae destruuntur.

Cùm enim Deus et Omnipotens et Æternus Pater creditur, Consempernus Eidem Filius demonstratur, in nullo à Patre differens: quia de Deo Deus, de Omnipotente Omnipotens, de Æterno natus est Coæternus, non posterior tem-

pore, non inferior potestate, non dissimilis gloriā, non divisus essentiā. Idem vero Sempiterni Genitoris Unigenitus Sempiternus natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Mariā Virgine. Quae nativitas temporalis illi nativitati divinæ et sempiternæ nihil minuit, nihil contulit; sed totam se reparando homini, qui erat deceptus, impendit; ut et mortem vinceret, et diabolum, qui mortis habebat imperium, suā virtute destrueret. Non enim superare nos possemus peccati et mortis auctorem, nisi naturam nostram Ille susciperet et Suam faceret, Quem nec peccatum contaminare, nec mors potuit detinere: Conceptus quippe est de Spiritu Sancto intra uterum matris Virginis; quae ita Illum, salvā virginitate, edidit, quemadmodum salvā virginitate concepit.

Sed si hunc de Christianæ Fidei fonte purissimo sincerum intellectum haurire non poterat, quia splendorem perspicue veritatis obsecratione propriā tenebrarat: doctrinæ se Evangelicæ subdidisset, dicente Mattheo, "Liber generationis Jesu Christi filii David filii Abraham:" Apostolicæ quoque prædicationis expetiisset instrumentum, et legens in epistolā ad Romanos: "Paulus servus Jesu Christi, vocatus Apostolus, segregatus in Evangelium Dei, quod antea promiserat per Prophetas Suos in Scripturis sanctis de Filio Suo, Qui factus est Ei ex semine David secundum carnem:" ad Propheticas paginas piam sollicitudinem contulisset, et invenisset promissionem Dei ad Abraham dicentis: "In semine tuo benedicentur omnes Gentes." Et ne de hujus seminis proprietate dubitaret, secutus fuisset Apostolum dicentem: "Abrahæ dictæ sunt promissiones, et semini ejus: non dicit, et seminibus, quasi in multis; sed quasi in uno, Et semini tuo, quod est Christus:" Isaiae quoque prædicationem interiori apprehendisset auditu, dicentis: "Ecce Virgo in utero concipiet, et pariet filium, et vocabitur nomen ejus, Emmanuel, quod est interpretatum, Nobiscum Deus:" Ejusdemque Prophetæ verba legisset: "Puer natus est nobis: Filius datus est nobis, Cujus potestas super humerum Ejus, et vocabitur nomen Ejus, Magni consilii Angelus, Admirabilis, Consiliarius, Deus, Fortis, Princeps pacis, Pater futuri sæculi."

Nec frustratoriè loquens ita Verbum diceret carnem factum, ut editus utero Virginis Christus haberet formam hominis, et non haberet materni corporis veritatem. An forte ideo putavit Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum non nostræ esse naturæ, quia missus ad beatam Mariam Angelus ait: "Spiritus sanctus superveniet in te, et virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi: ideoque et quod nascetur ex te Sanctum, vocabitur Filius Dei": ut quia conceptus Virginis divini fuit operis, non de naturâ concipientis fuerit caro concepti? Sed non itâ intelligenda est illa generatio singulariter mirabilis, et mirabiliter singularis, ut per novitatem creationis proprietas remota sit generis. Fecunditat enim Virgini Spiritus Sanctus dedit: veritas autem corporis sumpta de corpore est, et aedificante sibi Sapientiâ domum, Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis: hoc est, in eâ carne, quam sumpsit ex homine, et quam spiritus vitæ rationalis animavit. Salvâ igitur proprietate utriusque naturæ, et in unam coeunt personam, suscepta est à Majestate humilitas, à Virtute infirmitas, ab Æternitate mortalitas: et ad resolvendum conditionis nostræ debitum, Natura Inviolabilis naturæ est unita passibili: ut, quod nostris remediis congruebat, Unus atque Idem mediator Dei et hominum Homo Christus Jesus, et mori posset ex uno, et mori non posset ex altero.

In integrâ ergo veri hominis perfectâque naturâ Verus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris : nostra autem dicimus, qua in nobis ab initio Creator condidit, et quæ reparanda suscepit. Nam illa quæ deceptor intulit, et homo deceptus admisit, nullum habuere in Salvatore vestigium : nec quia communionem humanarum subiit infirmitatum, ideo nostrorum fuit particeps delictorum. Assumpsit formam servi sine sorde peccati : humana augens, divina non minuens : quia exinanitio illa, quâ se Invisibilis visibilem præbuit et Creator ac Dominus omnium rerum unus voluit esse mortalium, inclinatio fuit miserationis, non defectio potestatis. Proinde Qui manens in formâ Dei fecit hominem, Idem in formâ servi factus est homo : tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura, et sicut formam se i Dei forma non adimit, itâ formam Dei servi forma non minuit. Nam quia gloriabatur diabolus, hominem suâ fraude deceptum divinis caruisse muneribus, et immortalitatis dote nudatum duram mortis subiisse sententiam, seque in malis suis quoddam de prevaricatoris consortio invenisse solatium ; Deum quoque (justitiae exigente ratione) erga hominem, quem in tanto honore considerat, propriam mutasse sententiam : opus fuit secreti dispensatione consilii, ut Incommutabilis Deus, Cujus voluntas non potest suâ benignitate privari, primam erga nos pietatis suæ dispositionem sacramento occultiore completer ; et homo diabolice iniquitatis versutiâ actus in culpam, contra Dei propositum non periret.

Ingreditur ergo hæc mundi infima Filius Dei, de cælesti sede descendens, et à paternâ gloriâ non recedens, novo ordine, novâ nativitate generatus. Novo ordine, quia Invisibilis in Suis, Visibilis factus est in nostris : Incomprehensibilis voluit comprehendî : ante tempora manens esse cœpit ex tempore : universitatis Dominus servilem formam, obumbratâ majestatis suas immensitatē, suscepit : Impassibilis Deus non designatus est esse homo passibilis, et Immortalis mortis legibus subjacere. Novâ autem nativitate generatus ; quia inviolata virginitas concupiscentiam nesciens carnis materiam ministravit. Assumpta est igitur de matre Domini natura, non culpa : nec in Domino Jesu Christo ex utero Virginis genito, quia nativitas est mirabilis, ideo natura est dissimilis. Qui enim Verus est Deus, Idem verus est homo : nullum est in hâc unitate mendacium, dum invicem sunt et humilitas hominis et altitudo Deitatis. Sicut enim Deus non mutatur miseratione, ita homo non consumitur dignitate. Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est ; Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculî, alterum succumbit injuriis : et sicut Verbum ab aequalitate Paternæ Glorî non recessit, itâ caro naturam nostri generis non reliquit. Unus enim Idemque est (quod sepe dicendum est) verè Dei Filius, et vere hominis Filius : Deus per id quod in principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum : homo per id quod Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis. Deus per id quod omnia per Ipsum facta sunt, et sine Ipso factum est nihil : homo per id quod factus est ex muliere, factus sub lege.

Nativitas carnis manifestatio est humanae naturæ ; partus Virginis, divinae est virtutis indicium : infantia parvuli ostenditur humilitate cunarum, magnitudo Altissimi declaratur vocibus Angelorum. Similis est rudimentis hominum, Quem Herodes impius molitur occidere ; sed Dominus est omnium,

Quem Magi gaudentes veniunt suppliciter adorare. Jam cùm ad precursoris Sui Joannis baptismum venit, ne lateret quod carnis velamine divinitas tegeretur; vox Patris de cælo intonans dixit: "Hic est Filius Meus dilectus, in Quo Mihi bene complacui." Quem itaque sicut hominem diabolica tentat astutia, Eidem sicut Deo Angelica famulantur officia. Esurire, sitire, lassescere, atque dormire, evidenter humanum est: sed quinque panibus quinque millia hominum satiare, et largiri Samaritanæ aquam vivam ejus haustus bibenti præstet ne ultra jam sitiat; supra dorsum maris plantis non sub-sidentibus ambulare, et elationes fluctuum increpatâ tempestate consternere, sine ambiguitate divinum est. Sicut ergo (ut multa præteream) non ejusdem naturæ est flere miserationis affectu amicum mortuum, et eumdem, remoto quatriduanæ aggere sepulturæ, ad vocis imperium excitare redivivum; aut in ligno pendere, et luce in noctem conversâ omnia elementa tremefacere; aut clavis transfixum esse, et Paradisi portam fidei latronis aperire: Ita non ejusdem naturæ est dicere, "Ego et Pater unum sumus:" et dicere, "Pater Major Me est."

Quamvis in Domino Iesu Christo Dei et Hominis una persona sit; aliud tamen est unde in utroque communis est contumelia, aliud unde communis est gloria. De nostro Illi est minor Patre humanitas, de Patre Illi est aequalis cum Patre divinitas. Propter hanc unitatem Personæ in utrâque Naturâ intelligendam, et Filius hominis legitur descendisse de cælo, cùm Filius Dei carnem de eâ Virgine, de quâ est natus, assumpserit: Et rursus Filius Dei crucifixus dicitur ac sepultus, cum hæc non in divinitate ipsâ, quâ Unigenitus Consempternus et Consubstantialis est Patri, sed in naturæ humanae sit infirmitate perpessus. Unde Unigenitum Filium Dei crucifixum et sepultum omnes etiam in Symbolo confitemur, secundum illud Apostoli dictum: "Si enim cognovissent, numquam Dominum majestatis crucifixissent." Cùm autem ipse Dominus noster atque Salvator fidem discipulorum suis interrogationibus erudiret: "Quem," inquit, "dicunt esse Filium hominis?" Cùmque illi diversas aliorum opinione retexissent: "Vos autem," ait, "Quem Me esse dicitis?" Me utique, Qui sum Filius hominis, et Quem in formâ servi atque in veritate carnis aspicitis; quem Me esse dicitis? Ubi beatus Petrus divinitus inspiratus, et confessione suâ omnibus gentibus profuturus: "Tu es," inquit, "Christus Filius Dei Vivi." Nec immerito beatus est pronunciatus Domino et à principali petrâ soliditatem et virtutis traxit et nominis; qui per revelationem Patris Eundem et Filium Dei est confessus et Christum: quia unum horum sine alio receptum non proderat ad salutem: sed aequalis erat periculi, Dominum Jesum Christum aut Deum tantummodo sine homine, aut sine Deo solum hominem credidisse.

Post resurrectionem vero Domini, que utique veri corporis fuit, quia non Alter est resuscitatus, quam Qui fuerat crucifixus et mortuus: quid aliud quadraginta dierum morâ gestum est, quâm ut fidei nostræ integritas ab omni caligine mundaretur? Colloquens enim cum discipulis suis, et cohabitans, atque convescens, et pertractari se diligenti curiosoque contactu ab iis, quos dubietas perstringebat, admittens: ideo et clausis ad discipulos januis introbat, et flatu Suo dabat Spiritum sanctum, et donato intelligentiæ lumine sanctarum Scripturarum occulta pandebat: et rursus vulnus lateris, fixuras clavorum, et omnia recentissimæ passionis signa monstrabat, dicens: "Videte manus et pedes, quia

Ego sum: Palpate et videte, quia spiritus carnem et ossa non habet, sicut Me videtis habere :" ut agnosceretur in Eo proprietas divinæ humanæque naturæ individua permanere, et ita sciremus, Verbum non hoc esse quod carnem, et ut Unum Dei Filium et Verbum confiteremur et carnem.

Quo fidei sacramento Eutyches iste nimil aestimandus est vacuus, qui naturam nostram in Unigenito Dei nec per humilitatem mortalitatis, nec per gloriam resurrectionis agnoscit : nec sententiam beati Apostoli et Evangelistæ Joannis expavit dicentes : Omnis spiritus qui confitetur Jesum Christum in carne venisse, ex Deo est : et omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum, ex Deo non est, et hic est Antichristus. Quid autem est solvere Jesum, nisi humanam ab eo separare naturam, et sacramentum fidei, per quod unum salvati sumus, impudentissimis evacuare figmentis ? Caligans vero circa naturam Corporis Christi, necesse est ut etiam in passione Ejus eadem obcaecatione desipiat. Nam si Crucem Domini non putat falsam, et susceptum pro mundi salute supplicium verum fuisse non dubitat ; Cujus credit mortem, agnoscat et carnem : nec diffiteatur nostri corporis hominem, quem cognoscit fuisse passibilem : quoniam negatio veræ carnis negatio est etiam corporeæ passionis.

Si ergo Christianam suscipit fidem, et à prædicatione Evangelii suum non avertit auditum, videat quæ natura transfixa clavis peperderit in Crucis ligno, et aperto per militis lanceam latere Crucifixi, intelligat unde sanguis et aqua effluxerint, ut Ecclesia Dei et lavacro rigaretur et poculo. Audiat et B. Petrum Apostolum predicanem, quid sanctificatio spiritus per aspersionem fiat sanguinis Christi. Nec transitorie legat ejusdem Apostoli verba dicentes : "Scientes, quod non ex corruptibili auro et argento redempti estis de vanâ vestrâ conversatione paternæ traditionis, sed pretiosi sanguine quasi Agni Incontaminati et Immaculati Jesu Christi." Beati quoque Joannis testimonio non resistat dicentes : "Et sanguis Jesu Filii Dei emundat vos ab omni peccato." Et iterum : Hæc est victoria quæ vincit mundum, fides nostra. Et quis est qui vincit mundum, nisi qui credit quia Jesus Christus est Filius Dei ? Hic est qui venit per aquam et sanguinem, Jesus Christus ; non in aquâ solum, sed in aquâ et sanguine. Et Spiritus est Qui testificatur, quoniam Christus est Veritas : quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cælo, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis ; et hi tres unum sunt :" Spiritus utique sanctificationis, et sanguis redemptoris, et aqua baptismatis ; quæ tria unum sunt et individua manent, nihilque eorum a suiconnexione sejungitur, quia Catholica Ecclesia hâc fide vivit et proficit, ut in Christo Jesu non sine verâ divinitate humanitas, nec sine verâ credatur humanitate divinitas.

Cum autem ad interlocutionem examinis vestri Eutyches responderit, dicens : "Confiteor ex duabus naturis fuisse Dominum nostrum ante adunationem, post adunationem vero unam naturam confiteor :" miror tam absurdam tamque perversam ejus professionem nullâ judicantium increpatione reprehensam : et sermonem nimis insipientem nimisque blasphemum ita omissum, quasi nihil quod offenderet esset auditum : cum tam impie duarum naturarum ante incarnationem Unigenitus Filius Dei fuisse dicatur, quam nefariè, postquam Verbum caro factum est, natura in eo singularis asseritur. Quod ne Eutyches vel rectè vel tolerabiliter aestimet dictum, quia nullâ vestrâ est sententiâ confutatum : dilectionis tuæ diligentiam

commonemus, frater carissime, ut si per inspirationem misericordie Dei ad satisfactionem causa perducitur, impudentia hominis imperiti etiam ab hac sensu sui macula per te purgetur: qui quidem (sicut Gestorum ordo patefecit) benè cooperat à suâ persuasione discedere, cum vestrâ sententiâ coartatus profiteretur se dicere quod ante non dixerat, et ei fidei acquiescere cui prius fuisse alienus. Sed cum anathematizando impio dogmati noluissest preberere assensum, intellexit eum fraternitas vestra in suâ permanere perfidiâ, dignumque esse qui judicium condemnationis exciperet.

De quo si fideliter atque utiliter dolet, et quâm recte mota sit Episcopalis auctoritas vel serò cognoscit; vel si ad satisfactionis plenitudinem omnia quæ ab eo malè sunt sensa vivâ voce et presenti subscriptione damnaverit: non erit reprehensibilis erga correptum quantacumque miseratio: quia Dominus noster Verus et bonus Pastor, Qui animam Suam posuit pro oibus Suis, et Qui venit animas hominum salvare non perdere, imitatores nos esse vult suæ pietatis, ut peccantes quidem justitia coerceat, conversos autem misericordia non repellat. Tunc enim demùm fructuosissimè fides vera defenditur, quando etiam à sectatoribus suis opinio falsa damnatur. Ad omnem vero causam piè ac fideliter exequendam fratres nostros Julianum Episcopum, et Renatum presbyterum tituli S. Clementis, sed et filium meum Hilarum diaconum vice nostrâ direximus: quibus Dulcitium Notarium nostrum, cuius fides est nobis sepe probata, sociavimus: confidentes affuturum Divinitatis Auxilium, ut qui erraverat, damnatâ sensu sui pravitate, salvetur. Deus te incolumem custodiat, frater carissime. Data Idibus Junii, Asterio et Protogene VV. CC. Conss.

ART. VIII.—THE CASE OF IRELAND BEFORE PARLIAMENT.

Ireland. A Letter to Earl Grey. By ARCHBISHOP MANNING. London : Longmans, Green, & Co.

MR. GLADSTONE closing the great debate, which has just recorded sentence of Parliament on the Established Church of Ireland, made a remarkable apology on behalf of his party for having allowed so many years to elapse without attempting to settle a question which they and all England now regard as of such a primary and critical interest. These were his words :—

The right honourable gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) says, “Why did you not deal with the Irish Church in 1866, when you asked for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act ?” My answer is, For a perfectly plain and simple reason. In the first place, circumstances were not ripe then as they are now. [Ironical cheers from the Ministerial benches.] *Circumstances were not ripe in so far that we did not know so much then as we know now with respect to the intensity of Fenianism.* [Cheers and counter cheers.] Nor was there any member of that Government who would have been, for one moment, justified in giving the official account of Fenianism which has been given within the hearing of us all during the last few weeks by the noble earl the Chief Secretary for Ireland. [Hear, hear.] But while that was our first reason, it was not our only reason. A second was, that we were occupied by the Reform Bill.

We cannot affirm that Mr. Gladstone’s apology is adequate to the gravity of the case. But apart from that consideration, it is certainly one of the most remarkable and melancholy admissions ever made by a British statesman in Parliament.

What, then, is Fenianism ? Let us briefly recapitulate the leading points of the history of this extraordinary conspiracy, which only becomes more and more formidable through each fresh failure, and which has at last succeeded in compelling statesmen to give that attention to the affairs of Ireland for which justice, charity, and policy had previously pleaded in vain.

Three years ago, when Lord Palmerston was still Prime Minister in perpetuity, the Irish Executive suddenly discovered the existence of a formidable treasonable conspiracy widely spread in that country, but having its base of operations in

America. It had been in course of organization ever since the year 1857 ; but so ignorant was the Castle of its existence, or at least its extent, that in 1864 the then Chief Secretary, Sir Robert Peel, was reported to have stated that there was only one Fenian in all Ireland, and that he was quite a harmless sort of person, and on very good terms with the police. Suddenly the plot was discovered, and the Castle proceeded to act with that restless panic-stricken energy which seems to be part of the genius of the place. Contrary to law, as we believe—an eminent judge said, on the Fenian trials at Manchester, that such an outrage could not take place in any country governed by British law—the police seized the type and suppressed the publication of a journal called the *Irish People* ; arrested its staff and a number of its correspondents throughout the country ; and, a few weeks later, captured Mr. James Stephens, reputed to be the founder and principal organizer of the Fenian Brotherhood. It was then boasted on the part of the Government that, by a few acts of extraordinary energy, they had crushed the conspiracy in the germ. The Attorney-General at the close of the Special Commission, which was issued immediately for the trial of the prisoners, congratulated the Court on the fact that every person of any considerable prominence in the conspiracy, with the single exception of James Stephens, had been convicted and sentenced. Sir Robert Peel, who was retiring from office, was invested with the Grand Cross of the Bath ; the Commander of the Forces in Ireland was called to the dignity of the Peerage ; and the Lord Lieutenant was shortly afterwards raised from the rank of a Baron to that of an Earl.

But Fenianism appears to have been organized, as a ship is built, in water-tight compartments. The arrests made by the Government were of undoubted importance ; but they did not for a moment impair the vitality and force of the organization. Mr. Stephens, while his indictment for high treason was being prepared, one night quietly walked out of Richmond prison, where he had been lodged for special security. Some of the officers of the prison had evidently assisted his escape. Much has been said of the readiness of Irish conspirators to betray each other ; but although the Government offered a reward of £1,000 for his arrest, Mr. Stephens remained at large in the city of Dublin for three months afterwards, and the police, though well aware of his presence, were utterly unable to obtain any clue to his residence. Thence he passed in a leisurely way through Scotland and England to France, where he embarked for America, discharging all the time his ordinary functions as Central Executive of the Brotherhood, with the

same ease apparently as though he were at large. So it began to dawn upon the mind of the Government that the Fenian conspiracy had a very much broader basis and a more elaborate system than they had supposed. Mr. Stephens baffled the Irish police, because he was served by a better police of his own. Fenian turnkeys had unlocked the gates of his prison. Fenian detectives bamboozled the detectives of the Castle. The Special Commission had hardly done its work with the Fenian conspirators, when courts-martial began to try Fenian sergeants and corporals, and their sittings lasted for months.

Whole regiments were said to be tainted. Two regiments of high standing in the army were summarily ordered to foreign stations, at a moment when a rising was apprehended from day to day, and soldiers were being poured into Ireland by every port. For a time the Post-Office even was suspected; and the correspondence of the Government between London and Dublin was carried by orderlies or Queen's messengers. During one period of a few days of great alarm, the Government occupied the telegraph offices in Dublin, and every message sent or received had to pass the *visa* of the Police. Such a proceeding was of course utterly contrary to law; and at this time the Government had not even got that degree of latitude which the suspension of the *Habeas Corpus Act* is supposed to give. The military preparations were on the scale of a great rebellion backed by a foreign invasion. At intervals, the garrison of the city was kept under arms day and night for a week together. Officers on leave were peremptorily ordered to rejoin their regiments. Barracks and armed posts were prepared to resist sudden assault. Arms and ammunition were removed from ordinary stores to fortified places, or magazines, under guard. Artillery was distributed in war proportion among garrisons of other arms. The military force occupying the country was raised to 25,000 men. The city police were armed with cutlasses and revolvers; and the Constabulary with breech-loading rifles. The coast was watched by squadrons of armed vessels; and a powerful fleet stood off Kerry watching for an American Armada.

Such was the attitude of the Government through the winter of 1865-6. The conspiracy made no active demonstration, but seemed to know how, without visible effort, to keep the Castle and the whole official administration in a state of prolonged panic. The resident gentry, trading classes, and population at large, did not seem to share these apprehensions; and, indeed, rather made fun of the fidgety action of the Lord Lieutenant. His Excellency, on the other

hand, did not attempt any appeal to the loyalty of the country. He acted as if the whole Irish nation were Fenian from top to bottom. At the moment of utmost danger to the public peace, the Government did not venture to call for the support of special constables even in the city of Dublin. Several years before, Lord Palmerston had refused to allow the volunteer organization to be extended to Ireland; and therefore the Executive had not the support of this invaluable civil reserve to fall back upon. But there are forty militia regiments in Ireland, many of which were accounted, when they appeared at Aldershot, equal to any troops of the line. The Government did not venture to trust them with their arms. The Irish militia has not been called out for exercise for the last four years. Its forty regiments are treated as if their disloyalty was notorious; and this force, which, with slight exceptions, was found reliable in 1798, may be regarded as disbanded on suspicion.

The faculty of producing panic of a continuous character on the part of the Executive is not a very efficient test of the real strength of an insurrectionary movement in Ireland. The Castle is always either in a state of panic or a state of jubilation. Up to a certain hour, Lord Carlisle and Lord Wodehouse represented Ireland as a happy pastoral Arcadia, full of placid herds, and people as placid. Then it was as if the whole country had suddenly become undermined, and a single step might explode society in utter ruin.

A Government which does not rest for its support against anarchy on the loyalty of the inhabitants of the country which it governs—a Government which cannot, or will not, trust to special constables, volunteers, or even county militia—must necessarily be to a great degree under the influence of its police; and in prolonging such a state of things, the police have an interest as positive as the conspirators. The Irish Government ignored or discarded whatever support was offered to it by the population of the country, and relied absolutely upon its police and upon the army—latterly discovering that it could not have complete reliance upon such regiments as contained a large proportion of Irish soldiers. Fenianism succeeded in surrounding the Irish Government with this atmosphere of alarm and distrust to an extent unprecedented in the annals of conspiracy.

When Parliament met in 1866, the *Habeas Corpus* Act was at once suspended. The extraordinary powers given to the Executive were unsparingly exercised. The Lord Lieutenant's warrants were issued in sheaves. Every Fenian agent upon whom the police could lay their hands was packed into prison.

From six to seven hundred such agents were arrested from time to time. The more remarkable of these persons, some of them officers of high character in the American army, some journalists of no mean ability, were tried for treason-felony, sentenced to penal servitude, and are now breaking stones at Portland in the company of burglars and garroters. When Lord Kimberley left office, there were, we believe, three hundred persons in gaol under his warrant. Still the Government knew no relief from alarm. The vigilance and discipline of the army was kept for months together in a state of the utmost tension. The western coast was still covered by a strong fleet. Then there came a formidable diversion. Apparently recognizing the fact that they were baffled for the time in Ireland, the Fenian leaders determined to carry on their war against the British Government by an attack on its North American provinces. Notwithstanding the exemplary vigilance of the United States Government, one column of the Fenian force succeeded in entering Canada; and though soon obliged to withdraw, it cannot be said that much military credit was gained by the troops who opposed them. The Horse Guards and Admiralty were thus obliged to turn their attention to the defence of the long, irregular, water-bound frontier of Canada; and the garrison of that country was considerably increased, especially in the arm of artillery. It is no exaggeration to say that during the year 1866 the Fenian conspiracy kept at least two-thirds of the disposable armed force of which the home Government retains the control in a state of constant movement and occupation.

When the Conservative Government succeeded to office, danger appeared to have greatly subsided; and Lord Naas, yielding to the natural humanity and confidence of his disposition, gradually released all except some forty or fifty of those whom he found detained under Lord Kimberley's warrant. The Queen was advised that she might announce to Parliament that it was the intention of her advisers to propose the immediate restoration of the privilege of *Habeas Corpus*. Fenianism was treated as so far extinct that the ordinary powers of the law would be quite adequate to cope with it. But hardly were the royal words uttered, when the many-headed hydra rose again from the ground, flung the whole empire into a frenzy of panic, and then suddenly vanished, leaving hardly a trace behind. Its first appearance was in the very middle of England. An attempt to carry Chester Castle barely failed, through the promptitude of the local authorities. The following week, a rising—scanty in numbers, but very general in extent, and which was an utter

failure so far as fighting was concerned—took place in Ireland. From Drogheda in the north to the remotest point of Kerry a disconnected series of rebellious movements were made—none in sufficient force of men or arms to do much mischief, and which came to an end precisely as if only a demonstration or reconnoissance in force had been intended. The police acted, excepting in some half-dozen places, with perfect loyalty and courage. The military were hardly called upon, except at Dublin, where they escorted the crowd of prisoners made by the police at Tallaght ; and in Kerry, where the insurgents led Brigadier Horsford into the mountains, and then gave him the slip. At this time, too, the season, which had been very fine, suddenly became so extremely severe, that the hope of maintaining an insurrection in the open country, if it had ever been intended, must have been speedily abandoned through stress of weather. And so it happened that, utter as the failure was, the Fenians did not lose courage, or abandon their enterprise, in consequence. Nor was the Government any stronger, except by its well-warranted confidence in the fidelity and the military qualities of the police. Three to four hundred prisoners were in their hands ; and the *Habeas Corpus* was once more suspended. More troops, more ironclads and gunboats, were despatched to Ireland. Steps were taken to fortify the police stations throughout the country. The Castle itself was put into a condition to resist sudden attack. The vigilance of the Executive appeared never for a moment to relax. Yet authority was evidently no nearer to being able to close with the conspiracy, and crush it once for all. A miserable pretence was now and then made of treating the whole system as the work of “a handful of contemptible foreign conspirators,” with whom the great mass of the Irish people had no sympathy. But the handful of contemptible foreign conspirators so did their work as to keep a continual strain on the energies and resources of the empire ; and the Government of Lord Abercorn, like the Government of Lord Kimberley, had so little confidence in the sympathy of the Irish people that they made no appeal to it. In the moment of their utmost alarm, it may be not unfairly said that the Castle would have doubted either the sanity or the loyalty of the man who advised the Executive to call out the Irish militia, to form volunteer corps, or even to swear in special constables.

Then followed another diversion, far more extraordinary in its character and serious in its effect than the attack upon Canada. The scene of the principal operations of the conspiracy was transferred to England. First there was an alarm of Fenian privateers in the Channel, which kept the

Admiralty on the *qui vive* for some time. The discovery of a large quantity of Greek fire at Liverpool led to the belief that it was intended to burn that city in case General Burke, then under sentence of death, was executed. The arrest at Manchester of Colonel Kelly, the principal Fenian authority, followed; and his rescue, accomplished in the streets, in broad daylight, by open force, at the cost of the life of a deserving police officer, and of three Fenians subsequently executed for murder. Here the skill, energy, and resources of the conspiracy were again displayed with the same effect as in the case of the rescue of Stephens. On each occasion it was absolutely essential to the service and the credit of the organization to rescue the Head Centre for the time being from the custody of the British Government; and on each occasion the work was done so effectively, and the subsequent arrangements for escape were so perfect, that the police were utterly baffled. The three Fenians were hanged at Manchester amid elaborate precautions, the volunteers and several thousands of special constables having been called out to supplement the military force that surrounded the gallows, and occupied the gaol and its vicinity. Then it was that the extraordinary ascendancy which the continuous action of the conspiracy had gradually gained over the public mind made itself manifest. A panic spread through all England, which was suddenly intensified by the terrible Clerkenwell outrage; and in Ireland, for a time, the sympathy attracted by the courage and devotion which Allen and his comrades exhibited seemed to fuse the stagnant spirit of disaffection which pervaded the populace, up to the red heat of rebellion. There were signs that the Priesthood were for the moment not untouched by the immense emotion which agitated their people; and it seemed as if the deaths of those three young men had done more to spread and establish the spirit of the conspiracy than all the able operations of Mr. Stephens or even the sense of American sympathy and support. The conduct of the Government in declining to rely for aid on any class of the Irish population was thus apparently vindicated in the eyes of the English people; and ever since, the theory of the "handful of foreign adventurers" has been quietly relinquished as obviously inadequate to account for the circumstances of the case. England spent the last weeks of last year in a state of agitation and turmoil which could hardly be greater if a French army were marching across Wimbledon Common. Guard was mounted on the shipping in the river. The clerks of the Post-Office kept armed watch day and night through Christmas week over the mail bags. The floors of Downing Street were

littered deep with sand, so that Greek fire might soak and not burn. The police, expeditiously trained to the use of cutlasses and revolvers, patrolled in watchful couples. The Guards gravely expected from hour to hour the word to sally forth from their barracks and charge the London Irish. Arrangements for artillery were curiously complicated with the disposition of fire-engines; and it was hard to say whether the authorities most depended on Sir John Burgoyne or the Duke of Sutherland. The volunteers were ready. For safety sake, they commonly put their arms away in the custody of the regular army, not unfrequently unscrewing the nipples beforehand. In London and its neighbourhood 100,000 special constables were sworn in; and, seeing this goodly array of badges and staves behind him, the London policeman for the first time realized the full force of Garibaldi's apostrophe to him as the typical Briton. All the active forces of the conspiracy seemed to be suddenly deployed upon England. Thousands of sentinels shivered, listening through long foggy nights for the enemy expected at arsenals, dockyards, magazines,—the enemy who never kept his appointment, adding thereby, as it were, an unbecoming sense of irritating ridicule to the atrocity of his previous conduct. Then, nothing coming of it, this great alarm gradually evaporated; and by natural reaction as great a lull now follows, broken only for a moment by the vague, half-credited, but not at all improbable report of a Fenian attempt in preparation at San Francisco to seize on Vancouver's Island. Mr. Disraeli with audacious levity takes advantage of the occasion to assure the British public that Government has sounded the depths of Fenianism, and found that there is nothing in it; and Lord Mayo, with ingenuous confidence, cites Mr. John Mitchel's attack on that "wretched Stephens" as proof positive that the conspiracy is used up. But men who only care to ascertain the exact force of facts will do well to be chary of trusting Mr. John Mitchel's evidence implicitly with regard to any political matter in which he may happen to be involved. Mr. Mitchel never loved any cause to which he was attached half so well as he hated some man or men among his comrades in its councils. Mr. Stephens is at present the idol of his animosity. Between the political morale of the two men, there is not perhaps a pin to choose; and if they were to be judged by their style of speech, the fine confectionery of Mr. Mitchel's prose must always commend itself to persons of culture; but history, if history should ever condescend to make a contrast between them, will recognize that Mr. Stephens went and did what Mr. Mitchel spent his years in mooning and mouthing about.

When Mr. Mitchel attempted to organize a rebellion in Ireland, he wrote a number of the most exquisite newspaper articles—almost, if not quite, equal to Cobbett's; but one day, two policemen put him into a covered car and bundled him off to Bermuda. Mr. Stephens may be a very wretched person; but when he undertook the same task, he succeeded in organizing a conspiracy which has disgraced British policy in the eyes of the civilized world, and which moves like a thunder-cloud over the whole surface of the empire, filling the souls of men with sudden unaccountable dismay. Mr. Gladstone only says the simple truth when he admits that Fenianism is the immediate and efficient cause why the whole policy of England towards Ireland must forthwith be changed.

This conspiracy—curious compound of Yankee craft and tenacity with Irish devotion and enthusiasm—is the most extraordinary construction of the kind that has appeared in Europe since the French Revolution. Unlike all previous Irish conspiracies, its strength seems in no degree to reside in its leaders. They are from time to time deposed or captured; but utterly unknown men spring into their places and take up their work at once. Unlike all former Irish rebellions, it does not know when it is defeated. The English Press is never weary of ringing changes on the cabbage garden at Ballingarry. Young Ireland frankly accepted Ballingarry as a fact; but Fenianism, crushed at a score of Ballingarrys wherever it showed itself between Cork and Drogheda, reappears without delay, and deadly-lively as ever, at Chester or Manchester, in Glasgow or London—or in Canada, or on the high seas, or in Vancouver; why not next time at Hong Kong or Heligoland? These peculiar moral qualities it owes to its American education—to the race that remorselessly discards a “played-out” leader, and that “skedaddles” without shame, never once wavering, nevertheless, in its set will to win. In the audacious ubiquity of its operations, Fenianism has also learned somewhat from the land of magnificent distances. But the audacity is even more remarkable than the ubiquity. The Poles never ventured to carry their scene of action from Warsaw to Moscow; nor in the worst days of Venetian, or Magyar, or Czech discontent, would it have been possible to produce in Vienna the peculiar atmosphere of alarm which pervaded London in the last week of last year. From the Italian conspirators and their English commentators, the Fenians have also learned the advantage of a foreign base of operations, the art of manipulating foreign public opinion, of involving their cause with questions of foreign policy, and of employing gold collected abroad to spread

domestic disaffection. But the Italians in England were only patronized by a handful of advanced politicians. The Irish now and then hold the balance of American affairs, and are always a most influential political connection. The Italians with great skill acquired a by no means contemptible influence over English organs of opinion; but the American Press, speaking of it in a broad and general way, is to a considerable extent written by Irishmen who are Fenians, or by Americans who are more Fenian than the Fenians themselves. The Italians in England rejoiced with a great joy when Lord Palmerston constrained the King of Naples to release the English engineers who were captured in 1858 on board a Garibaldian piratical vessel; that was a great question for them, no doubt; and so is the *Alabama* question a great question for the Irish in America; and so, also, is the question of the efficacy of American naturalization; while the question of ultimate annexation is rather forwarded by occasional desultory pegging away at the Canadian frontier. And if Uncle Sam should choose, as he may choose, to meddle some day soon in the affairs of Europe, what right has his most intimate friend and ally, the Czar, to meddle in the affairs of Crete that he has not got to meddle in the affairs of Ireland? To close this parallel, the Italians in England got, one way or another, some money for their purposes—not very much money after all, for the class of people in England who will subscribe for purposes of political assassination is limited; and that was the way in which their funds were spent for several years. But for every thousand pounds that the Italians got in England, the Fenians have got at least a hundred thousand in America; and the poorest of insurrectionary countries has produced the richest of conspiracies. The sums spent upon the expenses of the American organization, upon the Canadian expedition, upon the hundreds of military men and circle organizers sent into Ireland and maintained there under regular pay, on arms and ammunition, on hired vessels and passage money, on the legal defence of prisoners, and on attempts to rescue them, would mount to a budget like that of a small State. If willingness to spend money on a cause, and to risk life and liberty for it, be tests of any value in weighing human motives, what a terrible force of energy and passion there must be at the back of Fenianism!

Mr. Gladstone's sad admission is then, unfortunately, not without ample justification. Lord Russell had already, in his letter to Mr. Fortescue, propounded the same reason for a complete revision of the policy of the Liberal party towards Ireland. Would that it were possible merely to censure these

eminent statesmen for waiting until they were in opposition to see the necessity of redressing the wrongs upon which they now so warmly dilate! But the conduct of Liberal Governments for the last twenty years has been one of the principal and efficient causes of Fenianism in Ireland. They not merely neglected to do their duty in regard to the now palpable grievances of the country. They denied their existence. They insulted the Irish members who brought them before Parliament. Lord Palmerston said that Tenant Right meant landlord wrong. Mr. Cardwell declared the fixed determination of the Government not to yield an inch on the Land Question beyond a slight revision of the terms of his own utterly inoperative Act. Lord Russell declared that the Church Establishment must at all hazards be maintained. Sir Robert Peel assured the House that he and Lord Palmerston were determined to stand or fall by that Establishment. Signs were not wanting of late years that Mr. Gladstone was gradually detaching himself from the policy of his colleagues on this question, as well as on that of Reform. But in the head of the Government, and in the principal personage of the Irish Executive for five years before Lord Palmerston's death, it was impossible for the Irish people to feel any confidence. The country was not merely neglected: it was goaded and outraged where it was most sensitive—told that its wrongs were merely sentimental, and its condition prosperous beyond conception. If people did not like it, let them leave it. Some authorities even held that it was "the duty of every Irishman to go to America in order to make room for a bullock." Thus the people ceased to have hope from the Government; and their confidence in that parliamentary party which they had with a great effort and with very sanguine hopes elected in 1852, had been already cruelly betrayed. "Those who dug the grave of Independent Opposition, dug the foundations of Fenianism at the same time." The Liberal Government of the day had a large share in that woeful work; and they had able assistance.

Three years ago, writing on this same everlasting and inexhaustible subject, we said, "Candid and honest Englishmen constantly ask, What does Ireland really want? Ireland wants, on the part of British statesmen, a policy; and still more, on the part of the British Parliament, goodwill to assist and give efficacy to that policy; " * and we concluded by declaring our conviction that it only needed some more effective organization of their political power on the part of the Irish people "to

* DUBLIN REVIEW, April, 1865. Art. : "Wanted a Policy for Ireland."

persuade one of the coming statesmen of the next ten years—Mr. Gladstone, if not Mr. Disraeli—that it is his interest, and in a certain sense his necessity, to have a clear and comprehensive policy for Ireland." Unfortunately, the organization of political power has not been of the kind which we contemplated. Would to God that that had been freely given to right reason and to moral motives which is now being yielded to sinful plots and the shame and terror wrought by lawless violence! But at all events Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli are in the position which we ventured to forecast; and to each of them, his policy for Ireland is the crucial and essential policy of his immediate prospects, perhaps of his whole career. That the British Parliament is also at last wrought up to the point of giving effect to a very advanced and pronounced Irish policy, the majority of sixty which has just condemned the Irish Church proves.

Policy, indeed—whole systems of policy on the part of statesmen—abound to an extent that we did not dare to dream of three years ago; and they are in the main more comprehensive, more sweeping, than the most extreme Irish politicians of the period of the Tenant League ever ventured to propose. The most moderate measure on the Land Question, that has a chance of being accepted and carried, goes considerably beyond the proposals of Mr. Sharman Crawford's so wantonly decried Bill. Nor are we aware that on the subject of the Irish Church any proposal has ever been made on the part of the Catholics so radical, and so thorough, as that of which the Lower House of Parliament has just affirmed the principle.

Let us summarize the principal of these projects of policy.

I. The policy of Her Majesty's Government consists of several positive propositions, and some undertakings, which cannot be immediately put into execution, but which seem to be seriously intended. In the latter class may be considered (1) Certain proposals consequent upon the Report of a Royal Commission now sitting to make the system of National Education in Ireland more distinctly denominational; (2) the purchase of the Irish railways by the State, or the vote of a loan for their relief and extension, if such should seem right on the Report of another Royal Commission which has just concluded its sittings; (3) the offer, if there be any chance of its being accepted, of an endowment, independent of State control, to the Catholic Church in Ireland—coupled, however, with the maintenance of the Irish Church as a State Church, but with considerable changes in its interior economy, such perhaps as a reduction in the number of its bishops. These

proposals, however, as we understand, it is not intended to submit to Parliament this session, except perhaps some temporary provision in regard to railways. It is proposed, however, at once (1) to give a Charter to the Catholic University, and to ask Parliament to add a grant for the maintenance of the University staff; (2) to introduce again the Land Bill, excellent so far as it went, proposed by Lord Mayo in 1867, and defeated then by a combination of the extreme Liberal and Orange members—with the addition of clauses from Lord Clanricarde's and Mr. Fortescue's Bills of the previous session, calculated to give greater facility of obtaining secure tenure; (3) to appoint a Royal Commission to ascertain what further alterations in the state of the Land Laws of the country are really required. To these may perhaps be added the Repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, or an equivalent measure legalizing the titles of our bishops with the affix "in communion with the See of Rome"—as is already the case in the American and Australian colonies. The Committee appointed at Lord Stanhope's instance in the House of Lords will, it is understood, determine the policy of the Government on this subject; and it is obvious now that it can only be determined in one sense. The Titles Act is dead, and even Earl Russell proposes to bury it. "To the members of their own Church," writes the noble lord to Mr. Fortescue, assuming the case of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, "each would assume his ecclesiastical title: Archbishop Trench would be Archbishop of Dublin to his own communion; Archbishop Cullen would assume a similar title in addressing the faithful of his own Church." We need hardly notice in connection with the Irish policy of the Government its Reform Bill, which is, except in the disfranchisement of several indefensibly small boroughs, identical in principle with the English and Scotch Reform Bills; and which, it may be hoped, will have the greatly needed effect of improving the quality of the Irish representation.

II. The policy of Mr. Gladstone is a very simple and sweeping policy. He proposes the immediate disestablishment of the Irish Church, and the gradual disendowment of that Church and all other religious bodies in Ireland. Regarding the grievances of that country, he takes this to be the one most flagrantly indefensible, and which, therefore, it is a statesman's immediate duty to abate. A triumphant success has vindicated his judgment in selecting the present time for delivering his attack. Whether he will succeed in carrying his proposals to their full extent appears to be already becoming in some degree doubtful; but he has certainly carried the assent

of Parliament and of the empire with him in his bold declaration that the Irish Church as a State Church must cease to exist. Having regard, on the one hand, to the positive declaration of the Irish Catholic bishops that they would in no circumstances accept for their clergy any share in the endowments of the Establishment; and, on the other hand, looking to the present spirit of the Liberal party on the subject of the relation between Church and State, and the question of religious endowments in general, Mr. Gladstone clearly saw that the policy most certain of success was the policy of absolute disestablishment and wholesale disendowment.

This policy necessarily involves the gradual extinction of the Presbyterian Regium Donum and of the grant to Maynooth College; and, in a word, the substitution of a complete self-supporting religious equality in Ireland. Mr. Gladstone calculates that the amount necessary to compensate vested and accruing interests existing in connection with the Establishment would amount to a sum equal to the value of from two-thirds to three-fifths of the present revenues, if capitalized. But we do not collect from the statement of his scheme, as yet necessarily somewhat vague, that he proposes this capitalization as a fundamental and immediate part of it. While concentrating his policy for the present on this single object, he has nevertheless given one very broad hint of his disposition to use the Church Question in settling the Land Question—which, within reasonable limits, we take to be a sound cardinal rule of Irish policy. He is rather disposed, following a suggestion of Mr. Bright's, to favour the settlement of the Church estates by peasant proprietors, and to apply the Church surplus to the acquisition of other lands to be so settled.

III. The policy of Earl Russell, detailed in his letter to Mr. Fortescue, suggested, and, from the way it was urged, almost compelled Mr. Gladstone's action against the Irish Church this session; but it is a totally different policy from that of Mr. Gladstone. Indeed he says, in so many words, that it is his own opinion "that the destruction of the Protestant Church in Ireland, the withdrawal of the grant to Maynooth, and of the Regium Donum to the Presbyterians of the North, together with a refusal of all subsidies by the State towards the building of Roman Catholic churches and furnishing glebes and incomes to the Catholic clergy, would be a misfortune to Ireland. It would manifestly check civilization, and arrest the progress of society in the rural parts of Ireland." Lord Russell proposes, in regard to the principal religious communions existing in Ireland, a system of co-ordinate endowments by redistribution of the property and revenues of the Establishment.

He proposes, therefore, the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, "the endowment of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, the endowment of the Presbyterian Church, and the reduction of the Protestant Episcopal Church to one-eighth of the present Church revenues of Ireland." Elsewhere he says, "A fair division of the rent-charge in lieu of tithes would give almost six-eighths to the Roman Catholic, about one-eighth to the Protestant Episcopal, and less than an eighth to the Presbyterian Church;" and he proposes that the question of property in glebe lands should be referred to investigation by a Commission. In regard to the Land Question, Lord Russell's views are very vague. He thinks "it is wise to give a security to tenants by such Bills as yours (Mr. Fortescue's) or *Lord Mayo's*, that the duties of property will not be violated with impunity but that no scheme violating the rights of property, which we are told were respected by Robespierre and the French Convention, and which are held sacred by the English nation beyond any other nation, ought to be adopted." The system of National Education, Lord Russell, on the authority of a passage in the Queen's Diary, describes as simply perfect.

IV. Earl Grey, in a letter to Mr. Bright, has stated a project of policy in regard to the Irish Church which is identical in principle with Earl Russell's, but which has the advantage, in addition, of having been considered in practical detail. Earl Russell appears to think that the property and revenues of the Irish Church could be at once sequestered, and distributed in eighths. But if the property were not immediately capitalized, which he does not propose, its actual redistribution, assuming that the present incumbents continue to enjoy their livings, would not take place for twenty years to come at least. Meantime, what a chaos of heartburning, envy, and discontent! Earl Grey proposes to distribute the property of the Establishment through Commissioners representing the several communions, in the exact proportions of the census; but he would either convert the property into capital or make other adequate financial arrangements. The Catholic Commissioners would be charged with the maintenance of the existing establishment of Maynooth, and the Presbyterian Commissioners with the present obligations of the Regium Donum; but at the expiry of current life-interests, the funds would be at the absolute disposal of the Commissioners for Catholic and Presbyterian Church purposes. As the sum thus left for the maintenance of the Protestant Episcopal Church would, however, be manifestly inadequate to the charge of its existing staff and establishment, Lord Grey proposes that Parliament

should "grant to it from the Consolidated Fund an annuity equal to the difference between the share of the Church revenue assigned to that Church, and the total of the present incomes of the prelates and clergy belonging to it"—such annuity only to last for the term of their lives. This plan of course assumes the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and proposes that it should have power to organize itself as a voluntary communion, on the same basis as the Episcopal Church of Scotland. It is also proposed that the State should purchase the advowsons of livings held by private patrons.

V. Mr. Bright's plan of dealing with the Establishment need hardly be stated in detail. It may be taken as discarded now that Mr. Gladstone's has been proposed. It offered Catholics a lump sum in general commutation of their claims and grievances; and if Catholics cared to enjoy the luxury of tall talk and the comfort of a pot of money at the same time, the arrangement would answer well enough. But if the Irish Catholics were to make any claim against the assets of the Establishment, they would claim their proper proportion. They make no claim, equitable or eleemosynary; and it is competent, therefore, to the State to sink the money, as Mr. Gladstone hinted might possibly be done, in the purchase of absentee estates, which is the second canon of Mr. Bright's Irish policy. The purchase of absentee estates and their settlement by peasant proprietors is a project which has a tempting aspect. But Ireland is a country of paradoxes. The relation of landlord and tenant in that country is an uncomfortable relation; but there are degrees in everything; and the relation is probably least uncomfortable on the property of a large absentee landlord, and most uncomfortable on the property of a small resident landlord.

The property of an English duke who only once or twice in his life sees his Irish lands, is managed with a certain large liberality of administration. The property of a Cork butter-merchant, or Belfast linendraper, who has bought ground under the Encumbered Estates Court, is let with a view to usury. Where two such properties march with each other at present, envy is rife; but if the tenantry who are already well off were raised to the rank of proprietors, the rest of the country would not improbably go in for a Jacquerie. For every good landlord bought off, we might hear of two or three bad landlords shot off.

VI. Mr. Mill, who has long studied and deeply sympathized with the case of the Irish tenantry, knows that at all events no partial remedy will redress the evil of their state; and the

remedy which he proposes, arbitrary in its character, would at all events be complete. He proposes the purchase by the State, not of absentee properties merely, but of the whole landed estates of the country—the price to be fixed by Parliamentary Commissioners, the land to be let on a perpetuity and valuation tenure to the occupying tenants, and the State to become the universal Irish landlord. Many objections have been made to this plan. It is revolutionary. But as Mr. Disraeli once said, and he says still that the spirit of his words was just, the remedy for Ireland is a revolution achieved peaceably by Government. The management of land by the State would, it is said, be found inconvenient and obnoxious. But throughout a great extent of India the Government is the landlord, and no inconveniences arise that seriously trouble the souls of civil servants. Gross wrong would be done to old proprietors with hereditary associations, and new proprietors who had cautiously speculated at the time of the Encumbered Estates Court. A great deal of wrong of this kind has unfortunately been done in Ireland from time to time, and is at the root of every Irish title. The hereditary proprietor, whose ancestor entered the country with William or Oliver, gave rather rude notice to his predecessor. The Encumbered Estates Court was itself a system of forced parliamentary sale, commonly at serious sacrifice. It is a confiscation assuredly, but at the full value of the land, and for the benefit of the State and the people—in a country where confiscation at the sword point, for the benefit of a class who, as a class, have managed to serve “neither king nor country” to their satisfaction, has been common. After all, it is only the right of eviction with compensation; and it never would have been heard of if the wrong of eviction without compensation had not been so flagrantly exercised. Who would ever dream of such a remedy, except against a class who lately conceived it to be their duty to depopulate their country, and who still persist in keeping the mass of the Irish people in such an utterly inhuman condition as tenancy-at-will? That the existing land system of Ireland must come to an end is plain to all men of common foresight; but assuredly it will be the fault of the Irish landlords themselves if “heroic” or revolutionary remedies have to be applied to their case. We believe—and in so far we differ from Mr. Mill—that there is yet time completely to reconcile the law of landlord and tenant in Ireland with fact and right; but the time is flowing fast, whose opportunity lost, the whole unholy structure, stained with blood and covered with curses, may suddenly come down with a rush, as the State Church is even now coming.

When we examine the proposals of Irish policy which come from the leaders of the Opposition, we are instantly struck by the absence of harmony which exists between them. Earl Russell, in the passage of his letter to Mr. Fortescue which we have quoted, strongly condemns the principle of general disendowment, which is the basis of Mr. Gladstone's plan. Earl Grey, in his letter to Mr. Bright, agreeing in principle with Lord Russell, strongly condemns the course which the noble lord advised, and Mr. Gladstone adopted, of forcing the present Parliament to pronounce upon the subject. "I think," he says, "that the course which is to be taken is not more likely to expedite the passing of a measure on this question than it is to bring about its amicable solution. . . . While I have no sympathy with the present Ministers, I deplore in the public interest the nature of the attack that is to be made upon them." Again, what does Earl Russell mean by referring (on the high and impartial authority of M. Quinet too !) to the remarkable respect in which M. Robespierre and the French Convention held the right of property ? Is that passage to the address of Mr. Mill, or of Mr. Bright ? Or is it only a gentle hint to the Irish landlords ? Whose were the rights of property that M. Robespierre so scrupulously respected ? Not the French landlords, we humbly submit.

A majority of sixty is, however, a great smoother of differences, and success has justified to many incredulous, the sublime sagacity of Mr. Gladstone's combinations, and the tact and temper of his conduct. Our readers are aware that in the order of Irish questions to be settled, the Irish Church—iniquitous and indefensible injustice that it is—still is not the one upon which we should have cared to see Parliament commence the work that must be done for Ireland. To this vote, however, we, too, heartily say, Well done ! It will give hope to Ireland. It is the earnest of a thorough policy for Ireland. It is "a message of peace to Ireland." It may even send a ray of kindly light through "the cloud in the western sky." Twenty-five years have nearly gone since Sir Robert Peel used those warning words in proposing the permanent endowment of Maynooth. Alas, that it should still be necessary for the great successor of his spirit, his policy, and his authority, to summon the British Parliament to do its duty in words of anxiety and alarm, where charity and justice ought alone to inspire !

In such a moment the Archbishop of Westminster has rendered a true service to the two nations—that which is his own, and that which he loves no less than if it were his own—in uttering the noble, thoughtful, and touching words which

he has addressed to Earl Grey. His voice has been heard, not in vain we believe, by English statesmen, and by the Irish people as well. It is the voice of a peacemaker, placed by Providence in that position where the conflict of the two races and the two Churches is perhaps of all others most clearly visible ; and it has been his lot to understand either side, from within as well as from without. So when he speaks words like these, they sink with all the weight of truth and wisdom into the hearts of men ; and the power which they breathe is enhanced by the fact that the position from which they are spoken is so unique :—

We ought to respect the sensitiveness kept alive in a noble people by the memory of religious persecutions which England desires to erase from its records, and by natural resentments kindled by repeated and terrible confiscations. I am not now about to recite the wrongs of the past, nor to rekindle the fires which have been, happily, dying down. We shall rejoice to forget the past, but on one condition. Let us hear no more of "sentimental grievances," no heartless assertions that Ireland has now nothing to complain of ; that the reign of Astrea is supreme in Ireland ; that the Irish do not know their own golden prosperity, created by English and Scottish industry, while they will do nothing but saunter and look on with folded arms. Let us have no more of this unjust and dangerous language, and we shall carefully refrain from raking up the embers of history. It needs little stirring to raise a flame. We Englishmen can be cool and calm in this matter, but we must not forget that the accumulated animosity of the past is born in the blood of Irishmen. My surprise is, not that they control it so little, but that they control it so much. The social and political inequalities, the religious persecutions, and the cruel confiscations of the past, might be more easily forgotten if they were not still embodied, visibly and grievously, before their eyes, in the ascendancy of the Protestant Establishment and of a minority. This is the recapitulation and representative of the policy of Elizabeth, James, and Cromwell, still living, powerful, and dominant. I will not, however, revive these other topics. We Englishmen ought, indeed, to be calm and to control ourselves. But can we wonder if no Irishman be as cold-blooded as we are ? It is this unreasonable, I was about to say this unnatural, mood of mind which renders the language of Englishmen so irritating to Ireland. "As vinegar upon nitre, so is one that singeth songs to a heavy heart." Such are the hymns to Irish prosperity in the ears of a population a century behind the national maturity which is their right. Society which springs from the soil, and forms itself by the tillage of the land, training its people to thrift and industry, and unfolding its steady growth in homes, hamlets, villages, towns, and cities—ripening by centuries of time, and binding all orders and inequalities of rich and poor, master and servant, together in mutual dependence, mutual justice, mutual charity, making even the idle to be thrifty, and the powerful to be compassionate,—this growth of human happiness and social order, which in England and Scot-

land is so symmetrical and mature, in Ireland has been checked at the root. The centuries which have ripened England and Scotland with flower and fruit have swept over Ireland in withering and desolation. We are beginning in the nineteenth century to undo the miseries of the seventeenth and the eighteenth. But let us not excuse ourselves by alleging the faults of national character. If our Irish brethren have faults, they are, for the most part, what England has made them. We Englishmen, with a like treatment, would have been the same.

And again, in this simple, striking summary of the case of Ireland before Parliament :—

So long as there exists upon the statute-book any penal enactment against the Catholic religion ; so long as the Catholic people of Ireland are deprived of a *bonâ fide* Catholic education ; so long as a Protestant Church Establishment is maintained by law over the face of Catholic Ireland ; and so long as the people of Ireland fail to derive from the land such a subsistence as the labourers and farmers of England and Scotland derive from the soil, there must be a just discontent, which will be the misery of Ireland and the danger of England.

But most remarkable of all, perhaps, for its thorough insight into the condition of the Irish people in their own country, is the passage on the Land Question, “the chief and paramount condition on which the peace of Ireland depends :”—

In comparison with this question [his Grace emphatically says] all others are light. It is the question of the people and of the poor ; of social peace or agrarian war ; of life or death to millions. . . . I am day by day in contact with an impoverished race driven from home by the land question. I see it daily in the destitution of my flock. The religious inequality does indeed keenly wound and excite the Irish people. Peace and goodwill can never reign in Ireland until every stigma is effaced from the Catholic Church and faith, and the galling injustice of religious inequality shall have been redressed. This, indeed, is true. But the “Land Question,” as we call it, by a somewhat heartless euphemism, means hunger, thirst, nakedness, notice to quit, labour spent in vain, the toil of years seized upon, the breaking up of homes, the miseries, sicknesses, deaths, of parents, children, wives ; the despair and wildness which spring up in the hearts of the poor when legal force, like a sharp arrow, goes over the most sensitive and vital rights of mankind. All this is contained in the land question. It is this which spreads through the people in three-fourths of Ireland with an all-pervading and thrilling intensity. It is this intolerable grief which has driven hundreds of thousands to America, there to bide the time of return.

No one could say these words with finer power or fuller effect ; and that they have told upon the minds of men we are

profoundly persuaded. It is in some such spirit, certainly, as is here entreated that English statesmen and the English people are at last addressing themselves to the settlement of their difficulties with Ireland.

May God grant that in Ireland peace may prevail to encourage Parliament in this great experiment, and that the conduct of the Catholics of Ireland in this momentous crisis of their politics may be worthy of the countrymen of Edmund Burke, of Henry Grattan, and of Daniel O'Connell! Irish questions are to-day Imperial questions, and they ought not to be pursued in the spirit of party. The policy to be applied in governing Ireland is the touchstone of the fortune of British statesmen. Mean must be the spirit of that Irish Catholic who can see in the events amid which we live only the victory of faction and the prospect of place. Much justice is due to Ireland. Let us take it gratefully from whichever side it is offered. Our conscience, our circumstances force upon us a policy which is neither Whig nor Tory, which must necessarily be in some sense eclectic and independent. Let us maintain our independence at least until we have attained equality; and while grateful to Parliament, and to him who moved Parliament, for the emphatic message of peace which it has just sent to Ireland and to America, in no way risk the work of this year for the work of next. Let us secure at once the Charter for the Catholic University. Let us secure, if possible, any substantial instalment of the justice long due, long denied to the Irish tenant. And even in the dismantling of the doomed Irish Church let us, in the hope that many who once dwelt within the shelter of its walls may, in the gracious providence of God, find their last home in that faith out of whose spoil it was built, yet act as becomes an ancient and a gentle nation—a nation which has never been consciously false to Catholic principles, or wantonly failed in Christian charity.

Notices of Books.

Discourse spoken by His Holiness Pius IX., on the 24th February, 1868, in the Sacristy of the Gesù, after the reading of the Decree by which he declared Venerable the Servant of God, Brother Egidius of Naples, of the Order of Friars Minors Reformed.

THE Italian, from which we have translated the following, may (we believe) be relied on as strictly authentic. It will have peculiar interest for our readers, because the country to which the Holy Father refers is understood to be England :—

“ The venerable servant of God, whom we honour in this assembly, was one of those men of whom our Lord Jesus Christ might have said : ‘ Vir simplex et rectus, timens Deum, bonus Israelita in quo dolus non est.’ He edified the world by that humility which is so necessary for the formation of Saints and for the consolation of the world. Jesus Christ wills that we should imitate Him, not in creation, not in miracles, not in giving sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, or life to the dead, but in meekness and humility. ‘ Discite a Me, quia uitis sum, et humiliis corde ;’ and in order that this truth might be better understood, He was pleased to be born in a stable and to live in the workshop of an artisan. He was pleased to choose poor fishermen for His Apostles, He was pleased to die upon the Cross. But this was not enough [with energy] : He has left us a record of His humility, in the Sacrament, wherein He hides Himself, and awaits in the tabernacle the approach of His worshippers, ready to shed abroad His graces upon all those who know how to ask them [with great feeling]. Moreover, he has promised to resist the proud and to listen to the humble. ‘ Infirma mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat fortia.’ And the Blessed Virgin herself teaches us the same in her canticle : ‘ Dispersit superbos, exaltavit humiles.’ ”

“ This Saint trod in the way of humility which is perfected by obedience, the humility of peace ; for there is no peace without humility. See what confusion there is among the proud. It is the confusion of Babel. We see it in the proud enemies of the Church, the enemies of her ministers [with great energy]. But let us lay aside the lamentations of sadness and sorrow ; let us say, rather, with the Prophet to the Church : ‘ Induere vestimentis letitiae.’ For now we see a mighty movement in the world, leading it to reunion with the centre of the Church. This movement is visible to all. At this moment, thanks to our Lord, a portion of the world has been illuminated with new light, and, wearied with falsehood and error, it is seeking the truth, as the thirsty stag pants for the waters. ‘ Quemadmodum cervus desiderat fontes aquarum.’ Many among you have often proclaimed this truth. You know that when the stag cannot overcome the obstacle which has kept him afar from the fountain, or free himself from the nets which entangle him, his ear listens afar off, and drinks in the murmur of the water ; and when his mouth cannot approach it, he seems to drink it in with his eyes. So is it

with the movement of souls who would now fain rush to the truth. What hinders them from quenching their thirst at these waters? The haughty and the proud men of this world. Yes: but chiefly, those who call themselves Catholics; who would divide the truth, combine it with falsehood, subject it to compromise [*transazioni*]. Chiefly these [with energy]. But in vain; truth always was, and always will be, one and indivisible. Truth is for all men,—for Mahometans, Jews, and Protestants, as well as for Catholics. It is your part, it is mine, to facilitate this movement, to encourage the good and to confound the bad, by making known the truth. Therefore, dear children, let us raise our eyes to the Lord; let us beseech Him to strengthen the union which exists among us over the whole face of the earth, that these poor souls, now athirst for truth, may have courage to embrace it. I pray to the Eternal Father for all these souls, who are entrusted to me, as His representative (although unworthy) upon earth, that they may be saved; that they may be one with me, as we are all one, 'ut unum sint.' For by union we shall confound the empire of hell. United in charity, united in doctrine, we shall behold the triumph of the Church; and the veils of lowliness, with which she seems now to be overspread, shall be changed into the ornaments of glory. Before I give you my blessing, dear children, I implore for you the graces of humility and charity: that we may be one upon earth, and may so come to the bliss of Heaven, which we desire for you all, imparting to you our paternal Benediction. D. V."

It will be observed that Pius IX. counts as the very principal obstacle to the spread of Gospel Truth, "those who call themselves Catholics," but who would "combine the Truth with falsehood and subject it to compromise." We do not presume to affix any definite interpretation to the Pontiff's words, but we think it important to record them. They may possibly receive some light by being compared with a letter written by his Holiness's command to M. de Beaulieu on October 22nd, 1864, which will be found at length in our number for April, 1865, pp. 479, 480.

L'Univers. Lundi, 24 Février, 1868.

THIS number of the *Univers* contains an account of the clerical Conference lately held in Paris, out of which various Liberals have tried to make controversial capital. Never was failure more signal. Before entering, however, on the conclusions of the Conference, it will be useful to recite various opinions held at this time as to the modern "liberties." These opinions, with sufficient approach to accuracy, may be classified under four heads.

Opinion 1. "A Catholic State violates the sacred rights of conscience and "transgresses the province which God has assigned to it, by prohibiting the "practice of non-Catholic worships and the publication of anti-Catholic "tenets."

Opinion 2. "Though the State has in strictness the right of suppressing "these liberties, yet when the human intellect has reached a certain degree "of maturity, this right should no longer be exercised. In the present state "of European civilization, it is a higher and more Christian condition of "things that Catholicism and Protestantism should coexist in a country,

"than that the State should be preserved in Catholic unity by measures of "coercion."

Opinion 3. "When some non-Catholic sect has taken root in a country, "and a body of hereditary non-Catholics is there to be found, it becomes " (under such unhappy circumstances) the most beneficial of all arrangements "that liberty of worship and of the press should be granted to that sect."

Opinion 4. "Even where hereditary non-Catholics exist in considerable "numbers, it would still be desirable, if it were possible, to refuse them "liberty of worship and of the press."

The fourth of these opinions is advocated by the Abbé Morel in his most interesting volume on "the liberal Catholics;" and we understand it to be intended in an admirable letter addressed by the Bishop of Nîmes to the *Univers*, of Feb. 28th. We do not think, however, that it prevails at all widely among Catholics. The *third* opinion is our own very decided one; and we understand it to have been expressed by the Archbishop of Westminster, in his language concerning the golden, the iron, and the silver age. (See our last number, p. 58.) We believe it to be much more extensively held within the Church than any other. As to the two first-named opinions, we must account them as errors infallibly condemned by the Church. (See on this head what we urged concerning the "Mirari vos" in January, 1865, pp. 58-68; and concerning the Encyclical and Syllabus in the following number, pp. 487-492.) It may be added, that no one who heartily renounces these two errors would be considered by any one to be a "liberal."

Those Catholics then who are free from all taint of condemned liberalism will hold as a matter of course that every politician acts more acceptably to God, in proportion as he makes greater use of his political influence towards the promotion of spiritual good. Yet these men may often differ widely from each other—and again from their respective confessors—on matters of detail; whether, e. g., on some given occasion spiritual good or evil would predominantly result from some given measure proposed in the Church's favour. It would be monstrous to suppose that in such a case a penitent is bound by his confessor's opinion. We may here use Mgr. Darboy's excellent illustration. The priest will earnestly enforce on his penitent the general duty of almsgiving; but he cannot impose on him an obligation of leaving, by will, e. g. £4,000 to the poor. In like manner he will earnestly enforce the general obligation of using political influence in the Church's behalf; but he cannot dictate the particular line to be taken on particular measures.

All this having been premised, the question before us becomes very simple. The parish clergy, assembled in conference, arrived with considerable unanimity at certain conclusions, which were heartily endorsed by the Archbishop. Our inquiry is this: Do these conclusions imply any tenet savouring of those liberal errors which the Church has condemned? Is there anything in them going at all beyond the obvious principle which we have just stated? The *Univers* professes to give a very exact account of these conclusions, and we translate them literally from its pages:—

"1. The Confessor ought to require from his penitent (doit exiger de son pénitent) that he submit himself to all the Church's doctrinal decisions, past, present, and future, even though they should contradict the doctrines

which may prevail among modern nations. For on this condition only is one a Catholic.

"2. In consequence of this principle, the Confessor ought to require that the penitent reprobate the absolute and unlimited liberty of printing and publishing every kind of opinion and of doctrine ; of practising every kind of worship ; of doing every kind of ill : for this liberty has been often condemned by the Church, especially in the Encyclical of December 8, 1864.

"3. As regards the liberty allowed to evil, restrained within certain limits, either the penitent can prevent the evil without producing more serious ill consequences, or he cannot. If he can, he is bound to do so (il le doit) : it is for this reason that S. Louis so severely punished blasphemers ; that England and the United States prevent profanation of the Sunday. And as a general rule (en *thèse générale*), every government which does not prevent injuries from being committed against God, against religion, and against morality, when it might do so without serious ill consequences, is enormously culpable. If the penitent is unable [to prevent these injuries without more serious ill consequences], he tolerates the evil ; but he may not favour it. He may not place on the same footing good and evil, truth and error. Toleration for evil and for error should be confined to that which it is impossible to refuse without raising serious disturbances.

"4. What are the limits within which toleration should be restrained, or to which it should be extended ? This is a question of which the solution depends on circumstances of place, time, person, public opinion, and on various other data, the appreciation of which is not within the sphere of theology, but rather appertains to politics. Consequently, on such points the Confessor may not constitute himself judge, but must leave the decision to any penitent whom he sees to possess the straightforward and pure intention of serving his religion and his country as best he may."

The proponent had maintained that, since liberal errors have not been condemned as precisely *heretical*, the Confessor may not require his penitent interiorly to renounce them. To this it was replied, that to hold errors which the Church has condemned, is *temerarious*, even where not *heretical* ; and is inconsistent with the requisite dispositions for Absolution. The first two conclusions of the clergy seem to affirm that the Confessor is even *bound* to exact from his penitent a renunciation of such condemned errors before giving him Absolution.*

* The *Saturday Review* always writes very unwisely when treating Catholic matters ; concerning which its writers are profoundly ignorant. But its issue of March 21 contains an article on this Conference even more foolish than usual. It interprets the first of the above-recited four conclusions as merely laying down, that no one can receive Absolution who doubts of Transubstantiation or Purgatory. It is hardly credible that any man in his senses can have written so absurdly. The second conclusion especially mentions the Encyclical of December, 1864 ; and refers generally to the unlimited liberty of worship and the press. Those "doctrinal decisions," therefore, to which submission is required in the first conclusion, are those which refer to liberty of worship and the press ; in other words, such decisions as the "Mirari vos," the "Quantâ curâ," and the *Syllabus*.

Dr. Ward is of opinion (second letter to F. Ryder, pp. 59-60) that the Confessor is not *bound* to refuse Absolution to those who will not accept these decisions as infallible, where invincible ignorance may (as almost universally it may) be legitimately presumed. But the Paris clergy apparently think that the Confessor is so bound.

Then as to true doctrine on religious liberty, the third conclusion speaks most unmistakably. "Toleration" of religious "error," say the clergy, "should be confined to that which it is impossible to refuse without raising serious disturbances."

This is not the language of liberalism, whatever else it may be.

L'Univers, Feb. 28, 1868.

THIS number contains that letter from the Bishop of Nîmes to which we referred in the previous notice. We quote from it the two following utterances of Pius IX. concerning the Syllabus: "The world is lost in darkness. I have published the Syllabus that it may serve as a beacon and bring back the world to the path of truth." "When the Pope speaks in a solemn Act, it is in order that he may be taken literally. What he has said is what he has intended to say."

Catholic Education. A Report of a Meeting of the Clergy of Dublin, held at Marlborough Street, 18th Dec., 1867. Dublin: Duffy.

Popular Education in England. By HERBERT VAUGHAN, D.D. London: Longmans.

THE controversy concerning popular education, which is just now of such tremendous moment, really turns far less on the question of *means* than on the question of *ends*. In fact, the respective advocates of the denominational and the secular system use the word "education" in two totally different senses. This circumstance is made clear in the various truly admirable orations delivered at the Dublin meeting; which we entreat our readers to peruse carefully, if they would have any adequate notion of the real matter at issue. By "education" the secularists mean "the development of intellect." And they consider "popular education" very important, in order that the lower class may "rise in the scale of being," in order that they may be clever enough to understand their own temporal interests; in order that they may have intellectual amusements which shall indispose them to crime; in order that they may choose for themselves—"as all men should choose"—their own view on things religious and political; in order, finally, that they may become an important supplementary element in the formation of public opinion. Far different is the view of the denominationalists. "Education," says F. Curtis (p. 21), "is nothing more nor less than a training of the human being for the performance of those duties which the Creator has destined him to discharge in this world: duties which regard God, his fellow-creatures, and himself." And since of these duties that towards God is of course the principal, education is principally a training of immortal souls in the knowledge and love of God.

The secularists wish to minimize the amount of religious doctrine taught, in order that men, as they grow up, may be more unbiassed in their

search for truth. But the denominationalists hold, according to the resolution proposed by Dean O'Connell (p. 17), that "education, to be a source of blessing, must be animated and controlled by religion ; separated from religion, it is *productive of innumerable evils* to individuals and society." Or rather indeed it is not "education" at all, in the proper sense of that word ; but only in that sense in which increased acquaintance with the various mysteries of vice can be called "education." It is a training of character in the devil's school.

But now, further : if education must be predominantly religious, religion may not be taught merely as one particular ; it must be the animating principle of the whole. Cardinal Cullen quotes with admirable effect M. Guizot's testimony to this truth (p. 9). "It is necessary," says the illustrious Protestant statesman, "that national education should be given and received *in the midst of a religious atmosphere*, and that religious impressions and religious observances should *penetrate into all its parts*. Religion is not a study or an exercise, *to be restricted to a certain place or a certain hour* : it is a faith and a law, *which ought to be felt everywhere*, and which, *after this manner alone*, can exercise all its beneficial influence upon our minds and our lives." And the Cardinal quotes another passage to the same effect (p. 129) from the Royal Commissioners of 1861. "The principal promoters of education," they say, "maintain that everything which is not merely mechanical . . . may and ought to be made the occasion of giving religious instruction. They maintain that the religious influence of the school depends no less upon the personal character and example of the teacher, upon the manner in which he administers discipline, upon the various opportunities which he takes for enforcing religious truth, . . . than upon the distinctive religious teaching."

The Dublin meeting was occupied not less with the higher than with popular education ; but its immediate scope, of course, was exclusively Irish. F. Vaughan applies the same identical principles to the particular question of popular education in England. There is a certain awkwardness in our expressing any eulogy on his pamphlet, as it is but a reprint (with important additions) of an article in our January number. Its general drift is this :—The mass of godless ignorance in England is appalling ; and the State violates its most sacred duty if it does not vigorously exert itself to remedy the terrible disease. There is but one way of doing this : viz., to promote denominational education. In England at present, beyond all possible question, the denominationalists are indefinitely stronger than their opponents ; yet F. Vaughan thinks that the good cause is threatened by two most serious dangers. Firstly, many denominationalists may acquiesce in this or that compromise—without seeing its real tendency—which will practically prepare for secularists a high road towards all they desire. Secondly, the various portions of the denominationalistic party may be deterred by their mutual religious differences from putting forth with sufficient energy a sustained and united resistance to the fearful evil of purely secular education with which England is threatened. It is perhaps not too much to say, that on the issue of this whole contest between denominational and secular education, more than on all other issues put together,

depends the future well-being of the English Empire. It is the one central point on which every Catholic public man should fix his attention.

Lectures on the Conventional Life. By the Right Rev. Bishop ULLATHORNE. Burns. 1868. Price 2d.

THIS very unassuming tract contains a much better explanation of what convents are, and a much better answer to the common, and indeed universal, prejudices of English Protestants with regard to them, than any other book we have met with. We cannot do our readers a better service than by calling their attention to it. The Bishop of Birmingham is well known among English Catholics to have had an unusual amount of experience in the government and direction of communities of religious women—first at the Antipodes, and now for many years in the midland district of England. He has thus acquired more knowledge than is possessed perhaps by any one Catholic among us as to the details of conventional life; while at the same time no one has had more practical experience of the “enormous lying” (to borrow a phrase from political life) by which our convents have been and still are assailed. The first of these homely lectures, after giving a short sketch of these amazing lies (for of course it is only a very slight sketch which decency and public morality allow to be given), passes on to answer the questions, “What are nuns?” and “What are convents?” Then it gives the Scriptural authorities for the life of religious, and then the earlier history of the institution. The second lecture gives a number of details as to the religious life; and here we have little doubt that there are very few, if any, even among Catholic readers, who will not find a great deal of information upon points of which they themselves hitherto knew little or nothing. It is given in a very interesting and lively form, so that it is impossible to lay it down when once taken up. This lecture will, we think, be generally found the most interesting of the three. The third lecture continues the account of the conventional life, especially explaining how liberty, in the true sense of the word, is most compatible with religious obedience.

The Irish in America. By JOHN FRANCIS MAGUIRE, M.P., author of “Rome and its Ruler;” “Father Mathew, a Biography;” &c. &c. London: Longmans.

THE appearance of Mr. Maguire's book—the result of a tour of observation made by him in the United States in 1867—is an event of importance not easily exaggerated. Its authority, its timeliness, the vast significance of the information it conveys, the pressing need in which English statesmen stand of being instructed on the subjects of which it treats, combine with the keen and vivid interest which it excites among the Irish race

everywhere, to lend to this book a weight and importance which seldom attach to any record of travel or investigation.

At last, the "Irish Question," in its many ramifications, has been fairly faced by Parliament, and its terrible importance to the life of the empire acknowledged. There is an end to the "pooh-pooh policy;" and in guiding the powers that be to the formation of a policy to be substituted for that, Mr. Maguire's book is simply invaluable. It establishes facts which cannot be denied, and which the Legislature will not dare to overlook; and it disposes for ever of fictions in which it has been convenient to affect belief, or at least to leave uninvestigated. The value of this work from a political point of view presses itself most powerfully upon the reader's attention just at present, and the mass of evidence which it presents on the subject of Fenianism is of paramount importance and interest. But the other sections of Mr. Maguire's great subject are quite as ably and exhaustively treated. It is a wonderful story which he has to tell: of how the Irish emigrants have toiled and prospered in America, how they have belied the prejudice and the false witness against them, how their lives and fortunes in the New World disprove the complacent reasoning which strives to show that they are unfit and unworthy to prosper in the Old. A more noble and touching story has never been written than this: its spirit and its pathos must charm and delight those who read it with sympathy for the Irish race. The stern witness of figures, the inexorable logic of statistics, cannot fail to startle, if not to convince, those who read it with prejudice and dislike towards them. The extraordinary prosperity of the Irish in America—their industry, helpfulness, generosity, and fidelity to their faith—their respect for education, determination to procure it for their children—their cheerfulness and undying attachment to their country and their own people, are finely drawn here by a skilful hand, guided by a heart full of proud sympathy and admiration.

But this book is no mere eloquent panegyric. The faults of the Irish in America—the exceptions to the general prosperity—the curse of drink—the dangers which beset the emigrant—the temptation to linger in the towns, and the ruin which comes of yielding to it,—these are all dealt with in the same spirit of candour and truth-seeking. In a page headed "The Secret of Prosperity" we find this passage:—"The golden rule of success in life was thus frequently expressed: 'To get on here a man must be industrious and well-conducted. With industry and good conduct, any man, no matter what he is, or what he was, or how he begins, can get on here, but not without these essentials. But the man who drinks, bid him remain at home; he won't do here.' Spoken in Nova Scotia, as the experience of people of all ranks, classes, and occupations, it is equally applicable to every province of British America, and every State in the Union. Industry, sobriety, good conduct,—these, under favourable circumstances, raise the humblest to the level of the great; and favourable circumstances abound in America." That is the keystone of the arch—favourable circumstances abound in America. Mr. Maguire found, almost universally, among his countrymen in the New World, those qualities in which they are popularly supposed to be most deficient, and is enabled, in

particular, to give a triumphant and categorical denial to, and refutation of, the calumny, which has found such ready credence in England, that the Catholic religion is declining in America, that the Irish are losing their faith, and that free institutions, material prosperity, and education, are inimical to its preservation. The large portion of Mr. Maguire's book which is devoted to the examination of the facts on this supremely interesting and important subject, is the most ably written of the whole ; and the formidable array of facts and figures which testifies to the devotion, the generosity, the splendid fidelity of the Irish Catholics—the living, glowing charity which abounds among them—is a priceless record. The eighth chapter of this book, which tells the story of Irish emigration in 1847, though not practically as important as the others, is of the deepest, the most painful interest. The ship-fever ; the horrors of Grosse Isle ; the noble devotion of the priests and the sisters, who had to shelter and protect 600 orphans, and did it ; the many instances of deaths, really those of martyrs in the cause of Catholic charity,—make up a story not to be read without deep emotion. The story of Bishop England's life and death, of the missionary labours of the Church, of the wonderful success of the conventional institutions, of the fierce persecutions and final triumph of the Catholics,—is of absorbing interest ; and the zeal and energy with which the propagation of Catholic truth is carried on, is proved by innumerable passages, of which the following is one of the most remarkable :—

“ It is not necessary to give a detailed account of the progress of Catholic education in America. Such is that progress, that the description of to-day would not suffice for to-morrow. Thus in the city of New York there are now about 30,000 children receiving education in Catholic schools ; but in all probability 40,000 would not fully represent the number that may be in attendance at the close of 1868. Somewhere about 1833, a single priest was ‘ attending Brooklyn,’ then regarded as a suburb of New York ; now there are not fewer than 12,000 Catholic children in Catholic training in that populous city. In places which have grown up within the last twenty years, I found from 12,000 to 15,000 children under various Religious Orders, notwithstanding that the Public Schools were likewise in full and successful activity. And even in small cities there were such numbers as 4,000 and 5,000 and 6,000, while the most strenuous efforts were made by bishops and priests to extend their school accommodation and increase the number of their pupils ; and in all cases the majority of the children were Irish—either Irish born or the offspring of Irish parents. The school that commences with 300 soon expands into 500, and the 500 rapidly grow into 1,000—and so on. In New York there are parishes in which the attendance in their Catholic schools is between 2,000 and 3,000 ; and in these parishes efforts are still made to extend the blessings of the best system of education to those who, perhaps of all other children in the world, are destined to be tried by the most dangerous temptations. I saw throughout the States large and spacious schools growing up in every direction under the auspices of the Church ; and I can remember how, when visiting a Southern city, which was slowly rising above the ashes of its desolation, I was impressed with the zeal of the Catholics—mostly Irish—who were erecting a fine female school for 500 pupils, which was to be placed under the care of Sisters.”

The reformatory system, under Catholic superintendence, is making great progress. Mr. Maguire devotes a chapter to it, which is followed by one

in which the entire history of the Church in the past is reviewed, and its prospects for the future are considered. The chapter concludes thus :—

“ Now, at any rate, there is no fear of loss. The day for that is gone. Wherever the axe of the pioneer clears the path in the forest, or the plough of the settler turns up the virgin soil of the prairie, the Church soon follows and erects the Cross ; and no sooner does the village begin to assume the outlines of the city than the Religious Orders, those noble standard-bearers and soldiers of the Faith, push on to protect and defend the rising youth of the race and religion of Catholic Ireland. The losses of the past are to be deplored, though they have been exaggerated ; but the America of the past is not the America of to-day.”

The story of the Irish in the war is full of interest, and it could have no more sympathetic and enthusiastic narrator than Mr. Maguire. The space at our disposal does not admit of extracts, or indeed of more than a general expression of the admiration and satisfaction which this remarkable, timely, and most able volume is calculated to inspire.

The Book of Moses ; or The Pentateuch in its Authorship, Credibility, and Civilization. By the Rev. W. SMITH, Ph. D. Vol. i. Longmans. 1868.

THE argument of this interesting and important volume needs an attentive study to do justice to its author. Indeed, for a full appreciation of its worth, it must be confessed that some previous acquaintance with the already voluminous literature upon the subject is indispensable. Dr. Smith has issued no mere literary essay to be hastily perused, and then set aside and forgotten. He has undertaken a thorough investigation, on purely critical grounds, of a question which has long exercised the ingenuity and learning of the greatest scholars of Europe. The keenest wit and the most varied erudition have been brought to bear against the thesis he maintains,—the genuineness of the Mosaic writings. Historians and philologists have sometimes been urged on to the attack against these, the oldest records of our faith, by the requirements of their newly adopted theories, or sometimes under the more transparent disguise of a philosophical system which has practically necessitated the denial of their authenticity. Several generations have witnessed the progress of the assault. What are the results ? This is no insignificant inquiry. For the Protestant sects within whose lines the conflict is being carried on, it is felt to be a vital question, and the bearings of such a controversy cannot fail to be of the utmost interest to the Catholic who watches it from without. The first aim of Dr. Smith has been to place the discussion on its proper footing, and to warn from the ground all those who, whilst professing to treat the subject as a matter of historic evidence, yet enter upon it with prepossessions virtually begging the question at issue. He then undertakes to show that if the appeal be made to the verdict of sound criticism and to that alone, the upshot of the inquiry must be the

triumphant maintenance of the traditional belief. We need scarcely point out how strong a claim such an undertaking should have upon our warmest sympathies, nor need we apologise for reserving for a future number a more full examination of the line of reasoning pursued and the precise results obtained in the volume now before us. We only hasten to congratulate the author on a literary success, which must be apparent from the first glance at the book, and to express our cordial satisfaction at receiving so brilliant an addition to our Catholic literature.

It is a matter of surprise that a work, so deeply felt as a want in this country, should not long ago have been projected. It has now, indeed, come from a somewhat unexpected quarter. Six years have gone by since Dr. Colenso made his first onslaught upon the authority of the Pentateuch, and there were surely not wanting earlier indications of a growing spirit of rationalism which would naturally make the Mosaic books a special object of attack. Much of the interest attached to the Bishop's work was undoubtedly owing to the peculiar position which he occupied as a dignitary of the Established Church, but its immediate effect was to popularise a controversy hitherto confined to a comparatively narrow circle. It was now too late to ignore the prevalent scepticism. With the clergy it had stepped from the private study to the pulpit, and it had quickly taken a hold on the periodical press, such as it had never acquired before. Yet, whilst a shower of polemical tracts and some few longer essays were directed against the individual views of the Bishop, it may fairly be said that there has been up to this time no attempt to give the question that complete and thorough treatment which it imperatively demanded. Excellent hints have been thrown out, and wise warnings uttered. Special objections have been answered with more or less success by different writers. But the fact still remains—and it is an astonishing one in a country which makes a boast of its sound conservative criticism—that we cannot name a single work which has as yet reached the highest standard of Biblical science. In no one case has there been taken a sufficiently comprehensive view of the whole ground to be occupied. The nearest approach to it in design is the "Introduction to the Pentateuch" by Mr. Macdonald. But this, although containing a large amount of useful information, is defective in arrangement, wears too much the appearance of a compilation, and exhibits a want of the requisite breadth of historic view. On the other hand, amongst the special combatants of the position occupied by Dr. Colenso, perhaps the "Layman" is entitled to take the highest rank for the critical ability and good sense which he displays in dealing with the difficulties of the Exodus, the Bishop's theory of the origin of the sacred name *Jehovah*, and other points. Yet this clever writer sadly disappoints us in conceding so large a portion of the latter books of the Pentateuch to be post-Mosaic. On the whole, we should be inclined to class him among the opponents rather than among the defenders of the genuineness of the Book of the Law—a place which belongs with equal justice to Perowne, the author of the article "Pentateuch" in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. From the spectacle of such manifest shortcomings in the best of English Protestant critics, we turn to Dr. Smith's first volume with a sense of entire satisfaction, and patiently await the remainder of his work with undiminished confidence.

For here the author's complete mastery over his subject is discernible in the solidity of the foundation which he has laid for the future superstructure.

When we have to deal with such men as Vatke and Von Bohlen, Bunsen and Ewald, who would eagerly lead us astray into the wide and mysterious fields of Phoenician nature-worship, or the literature of the Indian Vedas, among the hieroglyphics of Egyptian tombs, or even through the more recent but not more trodden path of early Arabian narrative, hunting amidst foreign legends and mythology in search of analogies to the origin and growth of Israel's religion, or the traditions of Genesis, something more is requisite than a mere Hebrew scholar. It is in this precisely that Dr. Smith's special merit consists. Research and sound judgment alike qualify him to check the eccentric fancies of comparative mythologists. Well versed in the Semitic dialects, no stranger to Sanscrit literature, having deeply investigated the mines of Egyptian archaeology, he is well enabled to cope with his adversaries on an equal footing.

Yet, after all, we are inclined to name as the most striking characteristic of our author the exceeding simplicity of his style and language, and the easy common sense English fashion in which he does his work. Here at once we find a strong contrast to the heavy and mystifying lucubrations of some of the best of our continental critics, whether orthodox or destructive. Dr. Smith's work would be a valuable contribution to Biblical literature, even if he had no greater excellency than that of placing within our reach, under a pleasing and intelligible form, the results of German apologists like Hengstenberg and Hävernick, which too often repel the reader either by their veriosity and viewiness, or by the clumsiness of their unwieldy erudition. A not less necessary and perhaps an equally rare accomplishment among scientific men is that of a close adherence to the point at issue and a methodical development of their subject. Mr. Max Müller, himself an adept in the art of both graceful and logical writing, commences one of his essays with the exclamation—"O that scholars could have the benefit of a little legal training, and learn at least the difference between what is probable and what is proven!" and he wishes for them the advantage of having occasionally to address "a jury of respectable tradespeople," that they may be forced to acquire the art of putting the most intricate and delicate points in the clearest and simplest form of which they admit. Dr. Smith need fear neither the fair judgment of scholars nor the verdict of a jury of respectable tradespeople, on the score of logical clearness combined with substance.

We may, in view of such admirable qualities, be half tempted to regret that Dr. Smith has so far limited his thesis to the critical and apologetical discussion. We cannot certainly complain of his having selected for his study a subject we consider so important. It is the foundation stone upon which all Biblical criticism must rest, and against which all hostile attacks are most anxiously directed. But the author has dropped here and there, perhaps unconsciously, indications of a power to illustrate a grander theme,—the inner life and spirit of the sacred writings, with that peculiar appreciation of its depth which is only to be derived from the union of theological orthodoxy with scientific research. In the first volume—they are, indeed, only indications, for dealing as he does with the question of authorship exclusively,

and that, too, without exhausting it, the examination of the Fragment and Complement hypotheses being reserved for the second—Dr. Smith has had few opportunities of throwing light on this more attractive portion of his subject, and he has most wisely refrained from introducing into the discussion all irrelevant matter. Yet the ability so undesignedly betrayed will make us look forward with increased interest to the forthcoming volumes; for, when examining the nature of the early Israelite civilization, Dr. Smith cannot fail to treat of matters at least intimately connected with the higher aspects of hermeneutical and theological science.

Verses on various Occasions. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

AMONG the various streams which of late years have flowed into the sea of Catholicism, Tractarianism occupies no subordinate place; and it is, moreover, peculiarly interesting to English Catholics, because its whole progress and characteristics have been so thoroughly English. Now no one had so prominent a position as F. Newman in directing the course of Tractarianism; and in studying his poems, therefore, Catholics may to a great extent learn the first springs, as it were, and intimate principles of the movement. But at this day the number is by no means small of those who owe their very possession of the Faith to F. Newman's influence; and these will peruse the volume before us with peculiar interest. Many of the poems will revive the keenest associations and remembrances in the mind of such a Catholic. They may remind him, perhaps, of this or that epoch in his life when some great thought was first explicitly presented to his mind by their perusal; some thought which has never quitted him since, and which, by God's grace, has borne fruit thirty-fold, sixty-fold, an hundred-fold.

Considering the great learning both of F. Newman and Dr. Pusey, nothing is more remarkable in early Tractarianism than the comparatively subordinate place assigned to intellectual researches as a means for arriving at truth. "Rule carefully your daily life in God's presence :" such was the predominant lesson. "Be zealous for such doctrine as you already hold: thus will God lead you forward to a fuller knowledge of His Revelation." This lesson might be illustrated by a large number of these poems; and we can only give one or two most inadequate illustrations of such a drift. Thus the following teaches that zeal for the spread of truth is requisite for God's service; and that oftentimes men cannot innocently content themselves with cultivation of the mere tranquil and domestic virtues.

" Give any boon for peace !
Why should our fair-eyed Mother e'er engage
In the world's course and on a troubled stage,
From which her very call is a release ?
No ! in thy garden stand,
And tend with pious hand

The flowers thou plantest there,
Which are thy proper care,
O man of God ! in meekness and in love,
And waiting for the blissful realms above.'

Alas ! for thou must learn,
Thou guileless one ! rough is the holy hand.
Runs not the Word of Truth through every land,
A sword to sever, and a fire to burn ?
If blessed Paul had stay'd
In cot or learned shade,
With the priest's white attire,
And the Saints' tuneful choir,
Men had not gnash'd their teeth, nor risen to slay,
But thou hadst been a heathen in thy day."

Yet such zeal must be founded on strict and (so to speak) homely conscientiousness :—

"Thou to wax fierce
In the cause of the Lord,
To threat and to pierce
With the heavenly sword !
Anger and Zeal,
And the Joy of the brave,
Who bade *thee* to feel,
Sin's slave.

The Altar's pure flame
Consumes as it soars ;
Faith meetly may blame,
For it serves and adores.
Thou warnest and smitest !
Yet Christ must atone
For a soul that thou slightest—
Thine own."

We will give but one more extract :—

"Thrice bless'd are they, who feel their loneliness ;
To whom not voice of friends nor pleasant scene
Brings that on which the sadden'd heart can lean ;
Yea, the rich earth, garb'd in her daintiest dress
Of light and joy, doth but the more oppress,
Claiming responsive smiles and rapture high ;
Till, sick at heart, beyond the veil they fly,
Seeking His Presence, who alone can bless."

Of the Catholic poems, the chief of course is the celebrated "Dream of Gerontius." Certain Protestant critics have made a very curious comment on this poem. They have represented F. Newman as intending to protest in it for more "spiritual" and "enlightened" views concerning Purgatory than prevail among his co-religionists. We can only say we never heard of any Catholics whatever, be their general school of thought what it might,

who have taken any exception at any part of the doctrine contained in this beautiful poem.

The present writer is one of those who must thank F. Newman heartily for having renewed in their mind, by the publication of this volume, so many grateful and happy memories of the past.

The Dogmatic Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer on the subject of the Holy Eucharist. By E. E. ESTCOURT, M.A., F.A.S., Canon of S. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham. London : Longmans. 1868.

WE have a special interest in this pamphlet, as Canon Estcourt had first intended to publish it in our pages. The first thing observable is his exceeding courteousness in his recognition of the existence of any "dogmatic teaching" at all in that strange book which goes by the name of "The Book of Common Prayer." That act of respect for the usage of civilized life accomplished, the writer proceeds to his work without the appearance of any compunction whatever ; the Anglican views are discussed, their history traced, and their meaning analyzed clearly, neatly, and thoroughly.

The Sarum Missal prevailed through the South of England ; but it differed not at all in the Canon of the Mass from the Missals of Hereford, Lincoln, and York. It is true that the people were accustomed to diverse rites, but they knew well that the difference never reached the substance. The first change to which they were subjected was to receive communion during Mass, in a way hitherto unknown to them—the priest addressing them in English. This once done, there came forth a new way of saying Mass, all in English, but to some extent modelled on the old rite of Sarum. Mr. Estcourt prints it, together with a translation of the old form, in parallel columns, so that the reader may more clearly and easily perceive the nature and amount of the change.

The first experiment made on the unhappy subjects of Edward VI., with a view to ascertain how far they had lost the ancient faith, was to give them communion during Mass after a new form and fashion. The wicked men who devised that form allowed Mass to be said as usual, in Latin, "without the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass." But they did vary enough to show what they meant to do : the people were to be communicated in both kinds, and in the rubrics of that office of theirs, the most Holy Sacrament, consecrated by true priests, was called Bread and Wine. Still further, these sacrilegious men directed the priest, if the chalice should be emptied before the communicants had all drunk of it, to consecrate anew ; and even a third and fourth time if necessary, in one kind. Upon this the Canon observes most justly as follows :—

"The priest who has already celebrated is directed to consecrate again in one kind only, and without communicating himself. It is impossible not to see in this rubric a denial both of the Holy Sacrifice and of the Real Presence" (p. 16).

This change in the ancient habits of the priests who said Mass, may seem at first sight incredible. It may be asked who were the priests who could fall into an abyss of sin like this? But if we look back a few years, all wonder ceases. These priests were all living in mortal sin. They had rebelled against the sovereign Pontiff and renounced his authority over them, and were no longer members of the Church. Their saying Mass at all was an offence against God.

In the following year, 1549, another change was made: the heretics in power devised something which they substituted for the Missal and the Breviary, and thus abolished even the outward semblance of religion. Doctrines which had hitherto lingered in men's minds rather than formed part of them, were now discarded, and there was no longer any pretence of saying Mass, though the authors of the change, with an evil intent, retained the word in the following form:—"The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." By this rite priests, validly ordained, undoubtedly consecrated, if they had the intention; but then there was to be no "elevation, or showing the Sacrament to the people." The adoration by the faithful was suppressed, and the people were gradually accustomed to the absence of reverence, that they might become really irreverent, sacrilegious, and unbelieving.

Of this new method the Canon most justly says—

"Every expression which implies a real and proper sacrifice had been carefully weeded out" (p. 40).

Here Mr. Estcourt has taken great pains to compare this Judaical rite with the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, for which it was offered as a substitute. We give one of the changes which he points out:—

"When we come in the Canon to the words, 'We do offer to Thy excellent Majesty, of Thy gifts and bounties, a pure victim, a holy victim, an immaculate victim, the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation,' instead of these we read, 'We do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make'—being a repetition of the dogma of the bare commemoration" (p. 41).

It is to be remembered that the rite to which these words are justly applicable was to some extent drawn up under Lutheran influences, and was also a further step towards denying the teachings of the Church, and imposing a contrary teaching upon the whole nation, if possible, through the means of a public form of worship. But after this came another change—of a worse nature it could hardly be—which made the revolution complete, and did away with even the semblance of a consecration.

The Prayer-Book of 1552, which superseded this of which we have been speaking, makes no provision for a consecration at all; the minister is directed to say a prayer without any ceremonial, but in which the consecrating words occur, yet only by way of narration. The minister is not directed to do anything, nor is there anything in the whole book which tends even remotely to show that there is either bread or wine on the "board" before him. Thus Rastel objected to Jewell, "Though you, Mr. Jewell, as I have heard say, do take the

bread into your hands when you celebrate solemnly, yet thousands there are of your inferior ministers whose death it is to be bound to any such external fashion." Irreverence and unbelief had done their work in the reign of Elizabeth, and the very services which the heretics retained were turned into mockeries, for the wretched men who used them felt it a sore burden to be tied down to any rule at all.

Now, at the Reformation there was already in England a great mass of heresy fermenting throughout the country ; it was too strong for the mere Lutherans, who seemed for a moment to be masters of it in the reign of Edward VI. Wicliffe's doctrines were widely prevalent in the land, and had in great measure ruined the people already. The Anglican notions of the Eucharist are his ; for he said, among other things, that the "consecrated Host is not the body of Christ, but an effectual sign thereof"—*efficax ejus signum*. Even the extreme language of the present day is wholly Wicliffe's, not excepting the gross and shameless buffoonery with which the Most Holy Sacrament is assailed by the foolish wretches who go about the country blaspheming God. He objected to and denounced the elevation and adoration of the Host, though he did both himself externally ; it was he who applied the term *idolatry* to the worship of God, and who maintained that "This is my body" is a figurative expression. It was from him that the Anglicans learnt to make their communion a mere commemoration. "All the Sacraments that he left here on earth," saith Wicliffe, "be but minds [memorials] of the body of Christ, for a sacrament is no more to say, but a sign or mind [memorial] of a thing past or a thing to come."—Wicliffe's "Wicket," sec. 15.

This heresiarch also anticipated another doctrine of the Anglicans—if it may be said that they have any doctrines at all—that of the "spiritual eating," and that the consecrating power is the faith of the recipient. Dr. Hampden taught this, but was not allowed to do so without protest on the part of certain of his co-religionists, though laid down in the Thirty-nine Articles in these words : "The means whereby the body of Christ is *received* and eaten in the Supper is faith." These are Wicliffe's words : "Panis sacra mentalis à fidelibus sparsim recipitur, consequenter irroratus fide evangelica in corde pinsatur, et igne charitatis induratus spiritualiter manducatur."—Dialog. IV., c. vii. fol. 110.

This "spiritual eating" is the doctrine of Zwinglians and Calvinists also, but they learnt it out of Wicliffe's books ; for it was those books, carried to Bohemia, that supplied John Huss and Jerome of Prague with the principles they held, and which their disciples transmitted to Zwinglius.

Cranmer was a man who had no sense of the importance of dogma ; for he was always willing to teach whatever the king for the time being required of him. With an orthodox sovereign Cranmer would have held the faith, and if he had any leaning towards any special opinions, it was in the direction of Lutheranism ; but it may be questioned whether he had any such leanings really at all. So when the foreign heretics of the school of Zwinglius grew strong, the native heretics of England drew near to them, and between the two Lutheranism was suppressed in this country, and Wicliffism came to be henceforth the religion established by law.

Mr. Estcourt sums up the conclusions he has drawn with great labour and careful pains in the following well-considered words :—

“ Those who receive and use the Book of Common Prayer, whether as ministering or as communicating, do by that their formal act make a denial of the Catholic Faith on several points, and a profession of various opinions condemned as heresy.

“ They deny the Holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist.

“ They deny the Priesthood of the Church.

“ They deny the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist.

“ They profess and assert that the Eucharistic Sacrifice is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving ; that it is a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice, nor impreatory ; that the Canon of the Mass does contain errors, and therefore it was right and necessary to abrogate it ; and that Christ our Lord in the Eucharist is given, received, and eaten spiritually only, and not sacramentally or really” (p. 57).

Such no doubt are the notions to be gathered out of the Anglican definitions and declarations ; and, indeed, none other can be consistently held by those who accept the book which the learned Canon has so carefully analyzed. There can be really no question about the matter, for it is only a very small section of Anglicans who hold the doctrines which their book repudiates, and even they cannot say that the Canon's interpretation of it is erroneous or unfair. S. Pius V., in his Bull “ Regnans in Excelsis,” describes the Book of Common Prayer as “ *libros manifestam hæresim continentes*,” and the communion office therein as “ *impia mysteria et instituta ad Calvini præscriptum* ;” those persons, therefore, to whom Mr. Estcourt refers as propounders of unionism and maintainers of the Prayer-Book at the same time, must abandon their views.

The Canon of S. Chad's has written a most useful and intelligible pamphlet, which people would do well to study before they make apologies for those, who seem to consort in spirituals with the ministers of the Establishment.

Lacordaire. By DORA GREENWELL. Edinburgh : Edmonston & Douglas.
1867.

THIS interesting little work is evidently written by one who is able to appreciate the greatness of soul which was one of the chief characteristics of Lacordaire. The poetry and elegance of style which distinguish the memoir are very fascinating, and will no doubt recommend it to a large number of readers ; while the interest which must be excited by so remarkable a life as Lacordaire's is enhanced by the deep sympathy of the writer with her subject. At the same time, the very enthusiasm with which the author paints one who is evidently almost her ideal of Christian greatness, painfully brings before us the pernicious character of those liberal views, which could captivate the mind and mislead the judgment of this almost heroically holy man. We are forced to remark, e. g., how even high interior

sanctity is insufficient of itself to guard a man of elevated feelings from an occasionally false estimation of the intrinsic value of intellectual acquirements. A Protestant biographer, such as Miss Greenwell, is perhaps not unnaturally led by such passages as we are about to quote, to the strangest misconception of Lacordaire's real meaning. In her opinion, they prove "the high value which Lacordaire at all times of his life placed upon eminent literary culture; that love of letters for the sake of their innate worth and excellence, which he seems to think is now on the decline," &c. Miss Greenwell is referring to his mention of one of his earliest literary friends, of whom he says:—

"This was an elder and more advanced student, the *good genius of my intellect*, who, during the space of three years, gave me gratuitous help in every branch of study, and who above all strove to inspire me with his own ardent love for literature, making me, when almost a child, read and learn by heart the tragedies of Racine and Voltaire. He was a *stranger to religious faith*, but a man of true integrity—a guide, a second father, who laboured to make me gentle and chaste, and who drew my aspirations to the *lofty summits of honour and literature* to which he had himself risen. I gained no distinction in my elementary studies at Dijon, and promised to remain a very ordinary student, until my attention was called to rhetoric, when all the seeds which this indefatigable friend had planted in my mind seemed to come into sudden vigour, and innumerable honours poured in. I associate *all that has been most fortunate in my life with his memory.*"

In a panegyric on Drouet, one of Napoleon's generals, Lacordaire again pays the following somewhat enthusiastic tribute to literature:—

"This veteran of the *grande armée*," he says, "was now old and solitary, but he felt no oppressive weight from either time or years. *For to the love of men and to the love of God he joined a third devotion*, once the distinctive passion of every nobly-gifted nature, but which seems fading from our present day—the love of letters. A *chef-d'œuvre* was to him a living being—a friend who comes for an evening talk. To take up a true book, to lay it on the table, to drink in its inner perfume, was to him a pure and intimate enjoyment. While others were limited to the present day, he was living in all ages and centuries; while others were confined to the religion of worldly interest, his mind was dwelling in the sphere of the beautiful.

"Rare and excellent life! one to which we cannot rise through taste alone, but which requires character and goodness. Literature demands, according to the expression of the ancients, a *cultus*; and as we speak of the religion of honour, we may also speak of the religion of literature."

Now, of course, Lacordaire could not seriously have meant what, taking these passages too literally, Miss Greenwell has supposed them to mean; and the stress she lays on them is most certainly unfair. Still there is a general tone about them, calculated to mislead any one not thoroughly conversant with the Church's spirit in such matters.

Another point out of which Miss Greenwell makes great capital, is Lacordaire's treatment of the Inquisition and its operations. Surely it will always be hopeless for a Catholic to deny that the Church countenanced a line of conduct which (as all the world knows) was directly under her sanction. Accordingly Lacordaire could not succeed in pleasing either party. Protestants

desiderate, as Miss Greenwell says (p. 231), "that firm explicit condemnation, not only of its deeds but of its principles," which they look for; and we hope that few Catholics will be content with a defence which "has not much to say in praise of men like the implacable Innocent III." (p. 226).

In spite of these drawbacks, and of the disadvantage at which they put Lacordaire with a Protestant, who is sure to make the most of every little point somewhat out of harmony with the spirit of the Church,—a memoir of this great champion of the crushed Faith in France cannot fail to contain many beautiful and most interesting traits of character. We can hardly tell, while reading, which to admire most; his generous public spiritedness, his touching humility, or the wonderful austerities with which he was so familiar. It is no wonder that such a mind attracted to itself so many ardent admirers and followers.

We always regret that Lacordaire's Catholic friends dwell with emphasis on the one most questionable particular in his whole character—his profession of liberalism. And it is curious to see how unmeaning is that sentence of his on which they love to dwell: "I shall die a penitent Catholic, and an impenitent liberal." If to die an "impenitent liberal" mean to die without repenting his profession of liberalism, to die a "penitent Catholic" must mean to die *repenting* his profession of Catholicism.

Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel: sein Leben, seine Schriften, und das Griechische Schisma. Von Dr. J. HERGENRÖTHER. Bände I., II. Regensburg. 1867.

DR. HERGENRÖTHER'S work, of which two volumes are now completed, treats of a period, the importance of which has probably no parallel in the history of the Church, except in the events of the sixteenth century. It would be impossible to praise too highly the minute care, the immense erudition, and the rare familiarity with out-of-the-way and hitherto unused materials which he has brought to bear upon his subject.

As an introduction to the life of Photius, Dr. Hergenröther devotes 300 pages of the first volume to a careful review of the previous history of the See of Constantinople and the gradual unfolding of the germs of conflict with the Holy See in the spirit of ambition which had long been almost a tradition of its Patriarchs. Here the history of the title of "OEcumenical Patriarch" and the contest on the subject between S. Gregory the Great and John the Faster finds a place, and sets in the clearest light the meaning of the holy Pontiff, which has been so often made a subject of controversy by Protestant writers. The rest of the first volume carries down the career of Photius to his exile, on the death of the Emperor Michael III., and includes two very interesting sections on the Conversion of the Bulgarians, and the history of the "Filioque." The second volume embraces the rest of Photius's life. The fifth book contains an excursus on the theory and practice of the Church during the first eight centuries on the subject of re-ordination. There is a

section also on the three Oriental Patriarchates and their bearing towards the Photian schism, which is most interesting. Crushed under the twofold pressure of Monophysitism and Mahometanism, these once powerful Patriarchates had ceased to bear an active part in the events which agitated the Church, and begun to disappear from the surface of her history; so that this inquiry taxes all the author's erudition and skill in piecing together scattered fragments of information.

Dr. Hergenröther's work seems specially well-timed for the needs of many earnest men in England just now, and we sincerely hope it will meet with a translator. The organs of the so-called Unionist party never lose an opportunity of displaying their tenderness for the schismatical bodies which they take a special delight in styling the "holy Eastern Church." One writer in a recent number of the *Union Review* goes the length of saying, "Let us therefore, in a spirit of *docility* and *reverence*, listen to the teaching of the holy orthodox Church" (Jan. 1868, p. 53). This tenderness for Eastern schismatics is used to justify and foster an anti-Catholic spirit, and these writers take care to represent the separation of the East as the fault of the Holy See, and Photius, his adherents and successors, as an orthodox and deeply-injured portion of the Church. Dr. Hergenröther's searching and dispassionate inquiry into the origin of the schism will not fail to undeceive the more thoughtful and sincere of the party. They may feel the more reliance on the author's judgment of Photius from the fact that, as he relates, "his writings inspired him with a certain prepossession in favour of the celebrated Patriarch, which made him incline to excuse his faults rather than to exaggerate them, and which kept him from too great a severity of judgment, wherever undeniable facts did not imperiously wring from him an acknowledgment of his moral offences and even crimes" (p. 6). Nay, he can praise where praise is due. "Profoundly as the Christian feeling is pained by the unhappy schism which owed its existence so truly and properly to him, to which he gave a permanent theological basis, and which by the misuse of his noble gifts in the service of unworthy self-seeking and love of revenge, he in every imaginable way cherished and fostered, the historian is not on that account prevented from awarding the highest praise to his amazing learning, and his rare merits on the score of theology, philosophy, philology, and history, and of science in general" (p. 6).

The same number of the *Union Review* from which we have quoted a sentence contains, under the head of "Fragmenta Varia," a well-known supposititious letter of Pope John VIII. to Photius, which not only condemns the insertion of the "Filioque" in the Creed, but even characterizes it as a "blasphemy." The document is introduced without any hint that it is otherwise than genuine, with the simple words, "Frequent allusion has been recently made to this celebrated letter, which is nowhere to be found in English, and is not accessible to the generality of readers. On this account we have much pleasure in inserting the following translation of it from the Latin text."

It is impossible not to hold the writer responsible for the inevitable effect upon the minds of many readers, not aware, as he must have been himself,

that the letter is rejected as spurious by almost every Catholic critic. We call attention to the subject here, because Dr. Hergenröther has gone into the question at greater length than previous scholars and in a most searching criticism (vol. ii. pp. 541-551) has conclusively shown, on internal and external grounds, its spuriousness. Among many other reasons, he states, what few scholars have had the necessary acquaintance with Greek mediæval literature to ascertain, that the letter is not referred to by a single Greek writer before the fourteenth century, even when it would have been most important for the argument (p. 542). And what is even stronger, that Photius, though he made the utmost in his controversy of the signature of the Legates of John VIII. to his Council, never alluded to any such letter either before or after the Pope's death.

Dr. Hergenröther promises a third volume, which will treat of the writings of Photius, of his theology, and of his influence on subsequent ages.

A Postscript on Church Choirs and Church Music. By F. CANON OAKELEY. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

A Letter to Canon Oakeley on the above. By His Grace the ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

Our Church Music. By the Rev. JAMES NARY. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

THE publications just named, which have all appeared since our last number, are a sufficient proof that the topic they refer to has become one of very general interest ; and, as one of these is from the pen of the chief ecclesiastical authority in this country, we may conclude that the various questions connected with the subject are destined to occupy a still further share of public attention. We had proposed in our present number to follow up our previous notice of Canon Oakeley's essay with a somewhat fuller treatment of the whole question, especially with reference to the fresh ground broken by Mr. Nary ; but as we observe that other publications on the same subject are announced, we think it better to defer our paper until the following quarter. Meantime we recommend to our readers a perusal of the pamphlets themselves. Canon Oakeley replies in detail to the objections made to his views as to the "material" of our choirs, and advocates anew the cause of "boy choristers *versus* female performers." The letter of the Archbishop speaks for itself, and its statements will doubtless be received with the respect due to whatever emanates from so high a quarter. Mr. Nary's publication is full of matter for thought ; not only on account of what he himself says, but also by reason of the authorities which he adduces ; and if we cannot follow him to the full extent of his conclusions, he has at least said much that deserves most serious consideration. Without anticipating what we may have to say on a future occasion, we may here remark that we do not see so much divergence as might at first sight appear between Canon Oakeley and Mr. Nary ; and we

think, moreover, that it will not be difficult to indicate a line which will not only reconcile the views of these writers, but enable all who are honestly desirous of seeing our public services conducted in the spirit of the Church, to occupy a common ground, and to work harmoniously towards a common end. Almost every one who has thought at all on the subject has come to the conclusion that things are not as they ought to be in regard to our choral arrangements, and that some considerable change must and ought to take place. What seems to be wanted, therefore, is that the energies of all who desire a better state of things should be directed, as far as may be, into a common channel ; and we shall only be too glad if we are able to contribute our humble quota towards such a result.

Giulio Watts Russell, Zuavo Pontificio. Dal P. VALERIANO CARDELLA, della Compagnia di Gesù.

History of Bernard de Quatrebarbes, Pontifical Volunteer. Translated from the French of P. DU REAU, S. J.

WE have before us two simple and touching narratives of Christian and chivalrous deaths *pro Petri sede*. One of these young heroes, who gave the flower and freshness of his bright and beautiful youth for the Vicar of Christ, we are thankful and proud to claim as a countryman of our own. There was a day, long ago, when the heart of the great S. Gregory yearned over the fair-haired strangers from the far-off Pagan land. There came another, when the loving eye of S. Philip rested in wistful tenderness upon the "flores martyrum" who came to Rome to be trained for the gibbet and the knife, and to make their blood the seed of a harvest which is now beginning to whiten the fields of our long barren and desolate land, and sending forth our English boys "to bathe the banner of Pio Nono" (we thank thee, Jew, for teaching us that word)* with their free, pure, young blood.

Many of the facts related of Julius Watts Russell, by F. Cardella, have already been made known to us. His pious, frank, and generous nature is well expressed in two Italian lines written by himself in a MS. book of prayers :—

"Anima mia, anima mia,
Ama Dio e tira via."

It was his practice, whenever he fired his piece, to say a *Hail Mary* for the poor soul which he might be the means of sending into eternity. These young soldiers of Christ have well earned the name of *Crusaders*. Such an anecdote is worthy of S. Louis. The innocence of the life, which was crowned by so glorious a death, may be gathered from his own words to

* We forget which of our English Protestant papers solaced its spleen at the victory of Mentana by the assertion that Pio Nono had bathed his banners in the blood of Italian boys.

a friend who had known him from infancy, and who watched by his bier ; "I cannot conceive what pleasure men can find in offending God :" and from the exclamation of his brother ; "Julius was so good that he deserved to die."

Bernard de Quatrebarbes, of a noble Breton house, was mortally wounded at Monte Rotondo at the age of twenty-eight.

He had just completed his studies in 1860, when the mournful day of Castelfidardo plunged every Catholic heart in sorrow. With sad, unflinching determination he left the home to which he was tenderly attached, "under the conviction that he thereby discharged a duty which should be sacred to every generous heart ;" and enlisted as a volunteer under General Lamoricière.

He sacrificed his desire to enter among the Zouaves on being told that he would be of greater use in the artillery. "He courageously submitted to all the requirements of his profession, and went through his military training in the foreign corps, under the command of the brave Captain Daudier. There he was destined to spend seven years of a life obscure, indeed, in the eyes of men, but full of merit in the sight of God. For Bernard de Quatrebarbes was one of that small band of noble youths who, having once pledged their faith to the successor of S. Peter, chose to continue under his banner, waiting in silence and humiliation until God in His good pleasure should bestow on them either martyrdom or victory. Like them, Bernard had to endure the rough labours of a private soldier—like them, he went into voluntary exile, bade a long farewell to a tenderly-loved family,—like them, he preferred suffering to a life of ease, and thus responded to the appeal so often and so distinctly uttered by the Vicar of Christ. Truly they have done great things for the holy Church of God, who have persevered and remained soldiers of the Church ever since Castelfidardo ! To watch and wait for seven years with the sword by their side on the steps of the Vatican was no less noble than to die at Monte Libretti, or to conquer at Mentana ; and it was more difficult. All honour, then, to this brave band, around whom so many other noble spirits came to group themselves !"

The unselfishness of Bernard's character amounted to heroism. "He had been for two years quartermaster, and his superiors, who had singled him out amongst all the others, had resolved to raise him to the rank of officer. Bernard received information of this, and learned at the same time that his promotion would retard that of one of his comrades, a young Italian, who was a volunteer like himself, but who had been longer in the service, and had only his humble pay to live upon. Without speaking to any one, Bernard took all the necessary steps and succeeded, not without difficulty, in preventing his own promotion over his companion. The consequence of this generous act was, that he remained for many months longer in the inferior grades. Subsequently the foreign battery was re-organized, and the whole regiment of artillery placed under Italian command. As this measure imposed new and painful obligations upon the French and Belgian volunteers, they nearly all obtained leave to enter the Zouaves, or to be sent home. Bernard de Quatrebarbes alone persevered, and resolved to remain to the end in a post of the greatest self-devotion."

When the troubles of last September began, Bernard, who had now

attained the rank of lieutenant, was on the point of returning home for a few months ; but the pressure of the danger induced him to remain ; and to him, according to the testimony of his brother officers, the chief glory of Monte Rotondo is due. His sufferings during the month he survived his wound were intense, and were borne with the same devoted resignation to the Will of God which had been the ruling principle of his life. "Who can pity him ?" writes P. du Reau, the Jesuit Father, whose narrative is here given to us in English. "His happiness is so certain, and his crown will be so glorious !"

"Such," he continues, "is the death of those young men whom we hear called mercenaries ! Yes, truly they are mercenaries, after the fashion of that great Saint whose ambition was to obtain God Himself as his reward. 'What reward wilt thou have from Me, Thomas ?' 'None other than Thy own self, O Lord.'

The Victories of Rome. By KENELM DIGBY BESTE, Priest of the Oratory. Washbourne. 1868. Pp. 47.

FATHER BESTE has traced with much historical knowledge and great eloquence the history of the contest between the Papacy and the world, "from the first day even until now." The principle which runs through his narrative is that the cause of God and the Church has in every age been represented by the Popes ; and that in every age they, like their Lord, have conquered by the cross. The form and manner in which they have been assailed has varied from age to age, but all assaults have been thus far alike, that the world has attacked one or other portion of Catholic doctrine or discipline ; that the vicars of Christ have carried on in its defence, a contest which appeared for the time utterly hopeless ; that they have, each in his age, been derided and reviled as men "who have turned the world upside down ;" that while each time of contest and suffering lasted, many even of those who, on the whole, stood on their side, have been tempted to blame, or at least to regret their conduct as wanting in prudence, or unsuited to the necessities of the age, perhaps as rash, or perhaps as cowardly ; that they have sacrificed, each in his turn, the peace of his own life ; but that, as years have rolled by, they have been seen and felt to have been guided by an unerring instinct, so that even those who have condemned their successors for carrying on, in their day, and in the manner which changed circumstances required, what was essentially the same contest, have felt themselves compelled to extol the Popes of former centuries, and to admit that, in their time at least, the Church was, even in temporal matters, the great benefactor of the world. "The Victories of Rome," as traced by our author, were, first, that of the Church in the Catacombs over the heathen empire in the Capitol and the Forum. Next, that of the Popes in the Lateran over the early heresies supported and maintained by the Emperors at Constantinople. Next, that of the same Popes over the barbarous nations which burst in with wild cries of rage to

tear in pieces the Roman empire. Next, that in the course of which those same nations, now moulded by the Popes into a Christendom, were marshalled by them against the Saracen and Turkish hordes. Of this last our author remarks that had the plans of European monarchs against Popes been successful—

“Islamism would have made another wilderness in the West. Europe’s plains uncultivated, would have been the review ground of its cavalry; the whole world, east and west, would have crumbled into decay under the fatalism of Mahomet. This destruction of Europe has again and again been averted, but only by the Popes. The sovereigns of Europe have reason to be thankful that there was, in 732, a Roman Pontiff, a S. Gregory III., to guide and direct Charles Martel, and by his blessing to send miraculous victory to the little Frankish army. On the altar of S. Peter’s the Holy Father blessed the medals to be worn in that battle of Poitiers by the champions of Christendom. No wonder that the Moslem, so oft defeated by the prayers of the Pope in S. Peter’s, should hate it, and impiously threaten to stable his steeds there in desecration. But no Pontiff has been subjected to such grief, and to such sacrilegious affront to the priestly honour. Constantinople, the city of the Emperor, has been taken by the infidel; but the capital of Christendom has been defended by the presence of the Pope.

“Europe has to thank S. Gregory III. for the victory of Poitiers. S. Leo III. for the victory of Ostia; S. Pius V. for the victory of Lepanto; Innocent XI. for the victory of Vienna. Europe should remember what Sultan Solymy said of S. Pius V.: ‘I fear the tears of this Pope more than all their arms.’ Nay, it is impossible not to conclude that, had the East remained faithful and obedient to the Popes, they would have been able to protect the East also; and the infidel would never have possessed the Holy places, nor be now enthroned in Constantinople.”

We have given this as a specimen, and not more than an average specimen, of our author’s style. We continue his list of the victories of the Popes. The next was over the kings of Western Christendom who desired to be Popes, “not in defining doctrine, like the speculative Easterns, but in exercising power, a task more congenial to their practical Northern natures. This evil reached its climax towards the end of the eleventh century, when the deliverer arrived—Pope S. Gregory VII.” Our author describes in four or five eloquent pages the contest which issued in the sufferings and exile of the Holy Pontiff, and in his victory, establishing the liberty of the Church. Next broke out against Rome the demon of revolution, represented in the first instance by Arnold of Brescia; and this struggle again was followed by the long contest with the Empire; by the exile of the Popes at Avignon during the 70 years of a Babylonish captivity; that again, worst of all, and during the same period, by “the great schism of the West.” After a short breathing-time, the restored peace of the Church was again broken by the outbreak of that enemy which has not even yet wholly passed away, the Protestant so-called Reformation. It is plain, however, that although the name of Protestantism still lasts, the real nature of the evil to be contended against has totally changed. It is now not any erroneous form of religious belief, but the spirit of infidelity and revolution. In this form, at the end of the eighteenth century, the spirit of evil once

more broke with all its ancient fury against the Rock of S. Peter. This struggle our author traces, to its temporary conclusion in 1815, and its new outburst in our own day. The end must be described by others, for "the end is not yet." Father Beste affectionately records the memories of the young English Zouave who offered his life for the Holy Father at Mentana, whose childhood, like that of many other Catholic boys now developing into manhood, owed its brightest hours, both of pleasure and devotion, to the Oratory of S. Philip Neri, and whom he now greets as "already a stately martyr, amid the white-robed host of Paradise :"—

"And was this defeat of the Garibaldian invasion a victory of Rome ? Emphatically, yes. Castelfidardo itself was a victory ; much more has the recent campaign of the little Pontifical army been a victory. Monte Libretti, Bagnorea, Nerola, Monte Rotondo, and Mentana, will be names spoken ere the Day of Judgment in every country under heaven. The brilliant bravery of all—Roman, Antibeian, Zouave—will give courage to all who have to fight the fight throughout the world. And it will stand recorded, that after years spent by statesmen, with all the resources of diplomacy at command, a few brave youths have restored meaning to the words—honesty, courage, fidelity. Men will record the strange and glorious fact that though the Zouaves died plentifully, not one of the young lions was taken prisoner ; and women will relate the tales of the charity of this Catholic chivalry towards their wounded foemen. Truly, they are the sons of a Holy Father, 'whose power is patience, whose majesty is endurance' (Faber). He has, indeed, planted in tears, tears to the end, fast falling at the requiem services for his young defenders. The world has still need to fear the tears of a Pope. Like S. Leo, Pius has saved Rome. He has seen the period of the Reformation drawing to its close, and confessing the triumph of the Church. Revolution may possibly make one last expiring effort ; but if suffering was predicted to the Sovereign Pontiff in his name of Pius, victory also is promised to it, and victory is attached to his cross, *IN HOC SIGNO VINCES*. Others will reap in gladness what he has sown in sorrow. The Church will always attribute her victory over revolution to Pius IX."

We have enlarged, more than its size would seem to require, upon this lecture, because we feel that it brings forward exactly and distinctly the special argument which ought to be presented to the minds of Catholics in our day. It is, in many respects, a day of discouragement, not more so perhaps in itself than many other times which have gone before it, but of a discouragement more widely felt than of old, because the general publicity of our times insures that the news of every assault against the Church and the Holy Father, in whatever country it may break out, shall be dinned into the ears of every quiet, peaceable Catholic in every region of the world. And the generally anti-Catholic character of the public press insures that whatever is related shall be related in a spirit of bitter and contemptuous hostility against the Church and the Vicar of Christ. And thus, whether we will or not, we ourselves, and not only the educated and learned among us, but the poor, the simple, the ignorant Catholics, live in an absolute atmosphere of unbelief and blasphemy. It has often been remarked that in other ages the Pope, even while in exile from Rome, was obeyed as implicitly as ever in the most remote regions of Christendom. So, thank God, it is still. Yet there is this difference, that most likely an English

peasant or mechanic in those days never even heard of the outrages against his Holy Father, and if he heard of them, it was only as crimes, denounced as indignantly as those of Judas and Herod. Now, for the first time, he is sure to hear every such outrage triumphantly extolled as a proof of the approaching destruction of the Catholic Church. Now, to counteract the unhealthy effect of this atmosphere, nothing is so efficacious as a knowledge of the past contests and victories of the Church, and that knowledge is exactly what our less educated Catholics have not. For their own sakes they should be taught, that all the insults and outrages of which Pius IX. has been and is the object, have been the lot, in every successive age, of the greatest and most saintly of his predecessors. He is but following them, as they, in their turn, were following their Lord, in solemn procession, up the hill of Calvary. It is by making them familiar with the past history of the Church that we must arm timid Catholics against discouragement under the troubles and dangers of our own day.

And we must specially bear in mind what Father Beste points out, that the attacks of the enemy will never be exactly the same in one age that they were in another, and, consequently, that the Catholic doctrines or practices which we are called upon to defend, will of necessity be different from those defended by our fathers. Well-meaning men in each age are tempted to forget this obvious truth. When the early heretics were to be combated, there were not wanting those who complained, how much harder it was to resist them than if, like the first antagonists of the Church, they had been heathens. In the same way many men in our times are tempted to complain that the Church, under Pius IX., is contending rather against political and social disorders than against false religious theories; or again, against errors in philosophy and religious politics, rather than in theology proper. This is, in fact, only to complain that the garrison of a beleaguered fortress must of necessity defend the particular bastion against which the assaults of the enemy are directed. The heaven-inspired instinct of the Catholic Church warns her in each successive age of the especial danger against which she is called to guard. Even her bitterest enemies are forced to admit that not Christianity alone, but civilization and letters were preserved by her and by her alone, during many centuries, and that all would have been lost if she could have been overthrown, or even materially weakened, "in the tenth, or even in the fourteenth century."^{*} At the present day they declare that her influence is all for evil; in distant times it was all for good. It is certain enough that if these men had lived in the tenth or the fourteenth centuries they would have urged that the Catholic Church had been invaluable in the first four centuries, but was mischievous then. And should it please God that the world should last for another thousand years, it is absolutely certain that the year of our Lord 2868 will see the world vehement in its attacks upon the Papacy,—and the Vicar of Christ calm and fearless, bearing the cross of his Lord and conquering by it: and almost as certain that it will find the most eager of the enemies and revilers of Pius XX. or Gregory XXX. reckoning Pius IX. among the greatest benefactors of Europe and of the

* See Lord Macaulay's statement, *History of England*, chap. i.

human race. It is the privilege of faithful and consistent Catholics to be found in each century firm and zealous in defending that particular point in the Church's bulwarks which, in their own age, is the especial object of the assaults of the enemy. It is sad to feel that in each age there have ever been, and now are, and will ever be, well-meaning Catholics who, while they feel the vital importance of all the other battles of the Church, would gladly see her abandon that particular fight which, at the moment, she is specially called upon to maintain. In the crisis of the contest of St. Thomas of Canterbury against Henry II., several of his suffragans represented to him, "We are placed in difficult circumstances, and the temper of the times requires of us large concessions." But the saint replied, "Know, my lords, that this temper of the times is the very thing that constitutes your trial. For when is it, I pray you, that a Bishop *is* called upon to expose himself to danger? Think you that it is in tranquil times?" The two speeches seem exactly to represent the spirit of Pius IX., and that of those Catholics who question his policy.

Non Possumus, or the Temporal Sovereignty of the Pope, and the Roman Question. By WILLIAM LOCKHART, B.A. Oxon, Priest of the Order of Charity. London: Philp.

FAATHER LOCKHART thus states his object:—

"We must keep the spiritual distinct from the temporal, remembering, moreover, that the spiritual part is essential, the temporal accidental to the character of the Head of the Church. Yet, if we consider the matter by the light of faith, of Divine Providence, or even of human justice, we shall find that in fact and in right the temporal is an inseparable accident of the spiritual. By inseparable accident we mean that which, though distinct in idea, and separable, actually speaking, in fact, yet morally cannot be separated, because such separation could only take place through a violation of the moral law, of the manifest will of God, of the great principles on which all rights of sovereignty, and all rights of property rest, and are constituted.

"This is our proposition, and we proceed to prove it by examining into the origin of the spiritual and temporal authority of the Popes, as we read them in the history of Christendom, and see them as they exist at the present day among the most patent and striking facts in the world."

The history and the contemporary facts which establish these propositions are well and clearly stated. Father Lockhart entertains an expectation which has long appeared probable to us, that the temporal benefits brought to the Roman people by the presence in their city of the Head of the Church are likely to be in future much greater than they ever were in times past.

"In fact, much as the tradesmen of Oxford and Cambridge live by the Universities, so do the lay inhabitants of Rome live by the ecclesiastical population, and by the constant influx of visitors, lay and clerical, from all parts of the world, who flock to Rome as the centre of religion, and therefore the focus of Catholic society, literature, antiquity, and art. This is likely to be greatly developed, for it is probable that whenever peace and security are restored, the ever-increasing facilities of communication will induce many

Catholics of all nations, without abandoning their own countries, to possess themselves permanently of an additional home in the spiritual capital of the world, or, at least, to come up as pilgrims in increasing numbers to visit the Eternal City.

"With the free consent of the Romans, Rome can never become a secular city, and sink from the capital of Christendom into the capital of Italy, if for no other reason, because it would be against their material interests."

What is newest in the little pamphlet before us is the clear proof it gives that the Garibaldian party feel and acknowledge that the Romans are against them. In short, the crusade against the Holy Father means a crusade to compel the people of Rome to become subjects of Victor Emmanuel against their will.

The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1866. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, M.A. Rivingtons, London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1867.

WHATEVER may have been the intentions of the author of *Ecce Homo*, he has done some accidental good. He has brought into prominence among thinking men in England an idea that is pregnant with immense results—the idea of the kingdom or society founded by Christ upon earth. Different periods of the world's history require different methods of evangelical demonstration. The Prophecies and the Miracles have been used for many centuries, and are in use yet. But, with a generation which requires to be previously argued with at great length before it will admit the miraculous at all, a change of treatment was evidently desirable. We find those whom we may assume to be honest inquirers going back to the sort of questions that had to be answered at the dawn of Christianity, by Clement, Origen, and S. Augustine. Theologians and preachers must follow the straying sheep into that part of the mountains where they are to be heard. It seems pretty evident that *Ecce Homo* has had a good deal to do with suggesting to Mr. Liddon the peculiar form and method of his admirable Bampton Lectures for 1866. Their whole scope may be summed up in the following theorem: Given the general authenticity of the Old and New Testament, to prove the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. The idea is well suited to our present needs. In England, the coarse assumptions of Strauss, and the more refined romancing of Renan, cannot be said to have met with a warm reception. Rather, the upshot of the Renan agitation has been, that people have come to a sort of agreement that the Gospels and the Epistles are what they represent themselves to be, and that all future controversy must aim at interpretation and not at destruction. Hence, there has been a general rush to the text of the New Testament. Mr. Liddon's Lectures, without being absolutely novel to a Catholic theologian, are a great assistance and a distinct step in advance. His style, without being transcendent eloquence, is dignified, powerful, and full of that earnestness which has made

him, perhaps, the most influential leader of thought among the present generation of Oxford divines. His learning is extensive and generally accurate : but there are passages of the Fathers which a more intimate acquaintance with Catholic tradition would have made him interpret differently ; and it is impossible not to be struck by the fact of his utterly ignoring the great theologians of the post-Tridentine period, such as Petavius, De Lugo, and, most of all, Francis Suarez.

After a preliminary statement of the question, the lecturer proceeds, in his second lecture, to examine the Old Testament proofs of Christ's divinity. As we have before stated, it is not his plan to consider the miracles and the prophecies as such, which are therefore put on one side. His thesis is, He whom the spirit that dictated the Old Testament foresaw, was to be a Divine Person. The Holy Record is made to give its witness in a style of brief and masterly handling, showing the immense force that lies, not so much in the single texts of Scripture, as in its general purport, in what it implies and in what it takes for granted. Here again we have an unmistakable evidence of the form and pressure of the age. When the Bible was left to the Sunday mercies of the clergy, high or low, and when freethinkers ignored it, the single text flung, like David's stone, at the heads of imaginary Philistines, was all that was expected. The probability was that the text had been picked up in a commonplace book, or by the help of a concordance, and that the slinger had not troubled himself about its native surroundings. But this must be changed now. Not but what every controversialist, worthy the name, has always made it a point to study context and connection ; but in these days, when inspiration is either not believed in or little realized by many who yet can bear to hear the Bible quoted, the great good to be done is by those who study to bring out the internal consistency, symmetry, and mystery of the inspired Word of God. "Testimonia tua credibilia facta sunt nimis." The Bible will stand the utmost degree of scrutiny. The more it is studied, the more credible and divine must it show itself to be. God's Word is a two-edged sword, useless or dangerous in the hands of a child, but indefinitely powerful in the hands of a strong man who has practised himself in its use. Mr. Liddon's treatment of the various classes of Messianic prophecies and prognostications is a useful study in Biblical exposition ; and his striking summary of the Old Testament apparitions of the "Angel of the Lord" is none the less useful because it might have been condensed out of the sixth book of Suarez, *De Angelis* (cap. xx.). We may add, however, that it would have been more to the point if the writer had told us more clearly what to think about them, as Suarez does.

Perhaps the best lectures in the book are those (III. and IV.) in which the thesis is developed from the work and words of our Lord Himself. At any rate they are the most interesting, partly because the newest, partly because the most completely worked out. It is these two lectures that directly challenge the conclusions, or rather the implied conclusions, of the writer of *Ecce Homo*. Lecture III., in which the writer analyzes and characterizes, first, our Lord's "Plan," and, secondly, its realization in the history of the Christian Church, may have some obligations to one of Dr. Newman's Parochial Sermons (Sermon XX., vol. iv.), wherein the same division is fol-

lowed, with some similarity of treatment, though, of course, not at such great length.

Lecture V., which is occupied with the Gospel of S. John, is, as might be expected, too short for a complete treatment of such a theme of controversy. Yet we should have been sorry to have missed Mr. Liddon's analysis of the fourth Gospel, with its astonishing boldness and marvellous consistency both with itself and with its predecessors. The succeeding Lecture, which treats of the Christology of SS. Peter, Paul, and James, is most interesting and convincing. We may especially point out the passage in which the writer treats Colossians i. 15-17, and shows how the "*eikón* of S. Paul is equivalent in his rank and functions to the *λόγος* of S. John" (pp. 475-9).

The Seventh Lecture gives an exhaustive review of the history of dogma on the subject of our Lord's divinity, down to the Nicene definition. In this section of his task it was to be expected that Mr. Liddon would contradict true Catholic doctrine; for an Anglican cannot easily speak about the Homoousion without making an attack on the Immaculate Conception. We would ask him, if he is in earnest about this vital point, to read F. Passaglia's treatise "*De Immaculato Deiparae Conceptu*," and then consider whether he ought not to modify his strong assertions about that dogma being "*truth unrevealed before*"; "*an hypothesis unheard of for centuries after the first promulgation of the Gospel*"; "*a new truth added to the Creed*" (p. 650). We need not recall to him what he so often repeats about the Homoousion, that a new *term* is not necessarily a new *teaching*. At any rate, what is quite certain is that the Pope did not consider it in that light when he defined it;* and, to be perfectly honest, Mr. Liddon should have let his readers know this.

The concluding Lecture, on the Consequences of the Doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, though eloquent and effective, is meagre and scrappy to any one who is acquainted with any of the classical treatises *De Incarnatione*. The writer seems to be unable to grant that our Lord's human soul had the Beatific Vision from the moment of His Conception; and he is on this account involved in much difficulty about His knowledge and infallibility, especially with reference to Mark xiii. 32. This only shows the disadvantage under which even the most learned of the Anglican clergy lie, through being cut off from the stream of Catholic tradition.

After all, allowing for a few drawbacks which are not the writer's fault though we must consider them his misfortune, this is a work that every one of us may read with profit and delight; and not without a prayer that one who can speak so well on a subject so dear to us, may have grace to see what society our Divine Lord really did found upon earth.

* This was ably pointed out by the *Month* some time ago.

Voltaire, sa Vie et ses Œuvres. Par M. L'ABBÉ MAYNARD, Chanoine honoraire de Poitiers. Paris : Ambroise Bray.

FROM 1854 to 1867 inclusive, no less than eleven considerable works on the apparently inexhaustible subject of Voltaire have been added to French literature. Of these, the Abbé Maynard's is the most important and interesting. It is a masterpiece of style, and the author may congratulate himself with as well-founded a conviction as that which Lord Macaulay felt that he had secured everlasting infamy to Barère, that by his hands the true Voltaire is thoroughly, and with incontrovertible and merciless logic, made known to the world. No panegyric upon the writer could set forth the merit and completeness of the righteous work he has done, so thoroughly as the cool, critical, masterly analysis of this great book by M. Louis Veuillot in the *Univers*; and further convincing evidence of its authenticity and importance is given by the large place it holds, and the weight attached to it in M. Georges Gandy's *résumé* of Voltaire and his Historians, in the seventh number of the *Revue des Questions Historiques*. The absolute impartiality claimed by the Abbé Maynard is carried out in this work, which exhibits equal erudition, good sense, and sagacity. He does not pretend to indifference, which would be impossible in an inquiry in which faith, morals, religion, and society are concerned; but he says, "impartiality is always obligatory, were it only out of respect for one's self, and confidence in the cause which one is defending; how much more imperative when one aims at the honour of defending truth against the son of him who has been called the father of lies!" The eighteenth century was, *par excellence*, the age of lying, and the Abbé does not claim more truthfulness for the adversaries than for the partisans of the anti-Christian philosophy. Hence the almost insurmountable difficulties of his task, as an impartial writer, bent on disentangling the true from the false in the mass of contradictions; hence his rejection of all assertions found in writings of the time; hence his adherence to the correspondence of Voltaire alone as his textual authority; and he even draws the nice and suggestive distinction that that correspondence shall be genuine, private, intimate, "written without a second envelope, or a secret address to the writer's contemporaries and to posterity." On such evidence, which the most prejudiced must admit, he proposes to prove the justice of his estimate and picture of Voltaire; he gives a copious list of the sources which he has drained for his materials, and thus announces his design and his conviction:—"Supported by such documents, the facts, as related in this book, are incontestable. The conclusions which I have drawn from them only are open to discussion. It is for the logical and impartial reader whether they, or those arrived at by the disciples of Voltaire, are more in accordance with the premisses. As for the author, he has but one desire, he asks but one favour, *viz.*, that he may be permitted to refuse to be, like so many, the dupe of the great comedian called Voltaire. Yes, the great comedian; Voltaire was never other nor more than that; and whoever does not regard his conduct from that point of view will fail to understand it. It has been said that

Voltaire never succeeded in producing a good comedy. This is a mistake ; he produced one which was excellent—his life." The author follows the hundred acts of this comedy with wonderful patience and merciless candour, sifting evidence, analyzing, combining, arguing, demonstrating with consummate skill ; and the result is a work in which Voltaire is exhibited to the world as the wonderful genius, the prodigy of wit, of artfulness, of meanness, of vice, and of dishonesty ; in short, the contemptible rascal he was—so shameless a liar, so pitiful a cheat, so mean and ferocious an enemy, so fickle and worthless a friend, so servile a courtier, so base and bitter a renegade, so filthy and depraved a sensualist, so cowardly and abject a blasphemer ; for he was always ready to commit a sacrilege to procure a momentary rehabilitation in the mind of some credulous priest who could serve his interests or his purpose for the time being. One is forced to recognize how amazing must have been the genius which made Voltaire so successful an impostor, which still survives the exposure which time has brought with it. The extraordinary perfidy of the man's nature, the devilish delight in deceit, appears from the earliest section of his history, and forces itself upon the reader as the characteristic which is dominant over all the rest, until the end. A few of the innumerable evidences quoted in this book would amply dispose of the theory, accepted by Voltaire's admirers, and lately supported by a writer in *Fraser's Magazine*, that *fanaticism* was no part of his character, and is impossible to the holders of the Voltairian creed. Those who claim for him the calm negation of reason, the philosophic composure of unprejudiced toleration, will find it difficult to reconcile their opinion with his own frequent and frantic declaration of enmity to Christianity, and his actual personal hatred of Jesus Christ ; to whom he ought, in consistency, to have been politely indifferent.

Setting aside the evidence of his works, which he exulted in or decried according to circumstances and the direction of his interests—those works whose object was to abolish the Saviour of the world ; even the "Bible Explained," which is a torrent of ignorant abuse of revelation ; the "History of the Establishment of Christianity," which is a denunciation of the Apostles—S. Paul in particular—as fools, fanatics, and rogues ; and the "Philosophical Dictionary," which is an encyclopædia of blasphemy,—his letters and his recorded sayings are full of this strange, devilish, individual hatred of our Divine Lord. He called himself "*le Christ Moyse* ;" and it is doubly useful and desirable that such a work as that of the Abbé Maynard should become well and widely known—that the school of Voltaire in the present day seeks sedulously to ignore that fact, and tries to claim for its master an enlightened accordance of respect to the founder of the Christian superstition, with a merciful toleration of his mistakes. The patronage of M. Renan is hardly so great an insult as would have been the discriminating toleration of Voltaire. But he had none ; he hated Jesus as the devils whom He cast out hated Him, and he cried out against Him as they cried out, when His sacred word rescued their victims. "You will never destroy the Christian religion," said Herault to him one day. "We shall see that," was his confident answer. "The destruction of the Christian religion is the mania of Voltaire," said D'Alembert to Frederick II. ; and the patriarch of

Ferney, the dear friend who afterwards became his coarse and unrelenting assailant, wrote thus to the "Protestant Hero" in 1760 :—"Our religion is indisputably the most ridiculous, the most sanguinary, and the most absurd which has ever infected the world. Your Majesty will render an eternal service to the human race by *destroying* [this from the Apostle of toleration!] this infamous superstition." The revival of enthusiasm for Voltaire is one of the signs of the times, and it is well indeed that the enemies of religion should not have it all their own way, that this "universal man" should be exhibited as the prodigy of evil—as the consummate example of intellect abandoned to the guidance of sin—as the perfect specimen of what a desperately mean and ignoble thing is human nature in a state of enmity to divine grace, he really was.

The Abbé Maynard's work is not only a powerful and most attractive book on a subject of profound interest, literary and otherwise, but a timely interposition in the cause of faith and morals. It is well that his shallowness, his ignorance, his worthlessness in those particular regions of the intellectual working world in which he claimed a too readily accorded supremacy, should be pointed out, that it may not be in the power of those who are trying to revive the worship of him of whom M. Gandy says, "it was to the divinity of Ferney that the Revolution dedicated her scaffolds," to silence the remonstrances of the pious, by the assertion that only ignorance can fail to honour the intellectual achievements of Voltaire. The calm, critical, circumstantial examination and analysis made by the Abbé Maynard of the man, the philosopher, and the writer, results in this : As a man, we find him a lying, cringing courtier—a wretched miser—a persecuting, vindictive hypocrite, whose career has only a few scattered acts of honour and vainglorious liberality to show—a vain egotist, whose shrieks of passion when anything wounded his vanity or thwarted his selfwill are hideously contemptible. As a philosopher, he is best defined in the words of M. Gandy : "His philosophy is a scepticism which his religious protestations refute—a morality independent of God and of conduct—a political system of egotism in action, confused and contradictory in theory—a humanitarian phraseology completely belied by his contempt for men, and especially for the people—by the sly condemnation which he lavishes on France." As a writer, he is in many respects incomparable, and it is alike impossible to admire his genius or to deplore its terrible misuse too much.

If eminent Frenchmen lend themselves to the project for erecting a statue to Voltaire in "that Paris which he so much loved," to use the *mot d'ordre* of the movement,—that Paris which he despised and maligned, toadied and sneered at, it is consolatory to know that one eminent Frenchman at least, the Abbé Maynard, has prepared a pedestal for it whose inscriptions M. Gandy thus enumerates :—1. To the apologist and the accomplice of the assassination of Poland. 2. To the contemner of France, the people, and humanity. 3. To the feudal *seigneur*, who, thanks to his privileges, paid nothing to the State. 4. To the personal enemy of Jesus Christ ; to him who desired to found the religion of lies.

The Abbé Maynard has done a service to the cause of religion and morals by this laborious and admirable work, which is worthy of the widest and the most grateful recognition.

S. Jérôme, la Société Chrétienne à Rome, et l'Emigration Romaine en Terre Sainte. Par M. AMÉDÉE THIERRY. 2 vols. Paris : Didier. 1867.

THIS work has already been named at the head of an article on S. Jerome in the present number, but it is of sufficient importance to demand a separate notice. Its several chapters, twelve in number, appeared first in the form of contributions to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, where they attracted some attention. M. Amédée Thierry is well known for his recitals on Roman and Gaulish history, and his studies have been particularly directed to the fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian era, the interesting period which covers the beginning and the consummation of perhaps the most marvellous change that Europe has ever undergone. It was to be expected, therefore, that, in approaching the Life of S. Jerome, the author would bring with him his calm and lucid eloquence and his well-earned erudition. But it is a pleasant surprise to find, in a work on a Catholic Saint, written from a non-Catholic point of view, so much candour and such unprejudiced appreciation of many points on which prejudice is the rule. The two volumes before us are a minute and painstaking life of S. Jerome. The writer, whilst he endeavours, on every possible occasion, to make S. Jerome his own biographer, has not scrupled to colour the narrative with his own views. He does not, therefore, present us with a mere mass of erudition, but with living and moving figures on a very real historical background. Perhaps the extent to which he investigates the collateral matters suggested by his subject spoils, in some degree, the interest of the principal story, and interferes with the excellence of the work as a biography. Still, the part which S. Jerome played in the world of his day almost makes it necessary for his biographer to give preliminary notices on such points as the social condition of Rome, or the history of the Origenistic controversy.* The quotations from original sources, which it is the custom of French writers of M. Thierry's school of literature to append at the foot of each page, greatly add to the value of the work, as they enable the reader, in most cases, to check any undue flight of imagination without sacrificing what is really valuable in the writer's illustrations. On the whole, though the author, as we shall remark presently, is not at all a safe guide on every question, yet we must pronounce his work to be the most complete and valuable life of the great doctor of the Scriptures that has ever appeared. The Benedictine Dom Martianay, who published his biography about the same time that he completed his edition of the works of the Father (1706), has fallen into chronological errors which make S. Jerome much older than he really was ; he is moreover prone to declamation and panegyric, besides being very incomplete in contemporary illustration ; though, as a

* Collombet's *Vie de S. Jérôme*, however, is unpardonably diffuse and tedious, owing to his continually dragging in dissertations on such distantly related subjects as Roman Education, the history of Victorinus (because S. Jerome *may* have listened to him), the study of Rhetoric in Rome, Baptism in the early Church, the Catacombs (because S. Jerome sometimes descended into them), the voyages of the Ancients, &c.

contribution to hagiography, his work has an unction and a spirit that will always make it pleasant reading to the devout. Passing over the notices of Tillemont and Dom Ceillier, we come to the life prefixed by Vallarsi to his edition, an original and exhaustive piece of industry, marking an epoch in the literature of the subject; unfortunately it is, in some places, very diffuse, and everywhere very dry, which is the chief reason why it is little known, except to the learned. F. Stilting's long and laborious compilation in the eighth September volume of the *Acta Sanctorum* is even more elaborate than that of Vallarsi, and, what is strange, makes hardly any allusion to it. The materials for a life of S. Jerome are all here, and much quite new matter about the posthumous glory of the saint; but it is rather a dry commentary than an artistic life. Collombet's truly Catholic and learned history of S. Jerome, both in its original French form (1844) and in its annotated German translation by Lauchert and Knoll, is likely to be always a popular work, in spite of its wearisome discursiveness.

In 1865, Dr. Otto Zöckler, a Protestant professor of theology at Giessen, published a useful volume, in which he states that it was his object to avoid all the defects and unite all the excellences of former biographers. It is useful because it quotes largely, and gives continual and abundant references, and is critical and exact in matters of chronology; but the latter half of the work, on the theological characteristics of S. Jerome, is worthless as far as its professed subject is concerned, on account of the one-eyed Protestantism of the author. Still later (1867), the Abbé Eugène Bernard, taking as his *motivo* S. Jerome's travels, brought out a readable, if rather weak, series of recitals on the salient events in the Father's history. Besides the works enumerated, there have been several less important essays on S. Jerome's life, in histories and encyclopædias, in France, Germany, and Italy.* But M. Thierry's biography, as it is the latest, so also is it the best. To criticism and great learning it unites two qualifications unknown before in S. Jerome's biographers; viz., a thorough command of contemporary history and a dignified, picturesque, and effective style.

In saying that M. Thierry is picturesque, it may be as well, considering the pardonable prejudice there is against picturesque writers of history, to add that he is only so in that legitimate sense in which a writer is picturesque who places his subject vividly before the imagination by his power of seizing in fancy and realizing in expression what is really in it. His brilliancy is, no doubt, partly owing to a bold and novel treatment of many incidents; and it may be granted that, once or twice, he has sacrificed some exactness for the sake of effect. For instance, he says (i. 39) that S. Jerome was "one day not a little surprised to hear Fabiola recite" part of his letter to Heliodorus, "under the same skies as he had written it." What S. Jerome says (Ep. 84) is simply that Fabiola knew this letter by heart. His treatment of the incident of S. Melania's flight is another instance. Indeed, the matter here is rather more grave than a mere sacrifice of exactness. M. Thierry says that S. Melania fled, leaving her only son at Rome, "sans avoir rien réglée pour son éducation ni pour sa nourriture. . . . Il fallut que le préteur

* See Zöckler, *Einleitung*, pp. 9-16.

urbain, chargé du soin des orphelins, nommât un tuteur au fils de Mélanie comme à un enfant abandonné." Will it be believed that the *Historia Lausiaca* expressly contradicts the first part of this assertion?* The fact is that she left her son as well off as a rich young patrician could be, and when he grew up, he showed he appreciated the motives that had made her abandon Rome, by his uniform dutifulness and affection. The flourish about the urban *Prætor* having to take charge of him, as of an abandoned orphan, is quite gratuitous. The reading is disputed.† And even if the son had been left to the *Prætor*, the natural hypothesis would be that the *Prætor* was a relative of the family. But the reading "*prætore*" would make it plain that the infant was *himself* *Prætor*; an idea which is not by any means improbable, and which is defended by Rosweid (*De Vitis Patrum*, lib. ii., *Præludia*, not. v.), and adopted by Fleury and Rohrbacher. M. Thierry wanted to make out S. Melania to have been a fanatical devotee, and his whole account of her is done in this style. It is well that his other portraits of venerated personages are more free from prejudice than this.

It was not to be expected that we should have no fault to find with him when he comes across the Papacy. It is natural enough for him to allude to the "various circumstances" which he considers to have had a share in giving to the Roman See that pre-eminence which becomes indisputable towards the close of the fourth century (i. p. 15). The "hierarchical organization of the Christian priesthood" dates from long before the time of Constantine. The primacy of the Pope was exercised and proclaimed long before the days of Damasus. Clement exercised it. Irenæus proclaimed it. Tertullian, in his very error and anger, testified to it. It was in virtue of it that Victor anathematized half of Asia on a question of discipline (201). Denis of Alexandria invoked it (270). And Cyprian said, "Communion with the Pope is communion with the Church" (Ep. 45).‡ All M. Thierry's ingenious explanation of how naturally the Roman See came to be the first See cannot account for the strong contemporary language of clear-headed and strong-minded men like Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome,§ while it fits admirably the theory of a primary Divine institution and a gradual providential development.

In spite, however, of these drawbacks, and of one or two other uncalled-for sneers and immature guesses, the work, as a Life of Jerome, is most acceptable. M. Thierry appreciates S. Jerome, and that is what Protestants cannot do, and what Catholics often do not; the former because S. Jerome is so unlike them, the latter because his sayings and his spirit have become so much a part of their spiritual instincts. The author has no contemptuous pity for S. Jerome's asceticism. He does not accept the popular Protestant view that the Apostles and the early Christians lived in the comfortable enjoy-

* "Cum curasset [Melania] ut filii sui nominaretur tutor."—*Hist. Lausiaca*, cap. xvii.

† "Unico prætori urbano filio derelicto." (Hieron. *Chronic.*) Fleury and Rohrbacher read *prætore*, which is in fact found in nearly every edition of S. Jerome.

‡ De Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain*, 1re partie, i. 139.

§ See Dr. Murray, *De Ecclesia*, iii. 19.

ment of the domestic affections and the goods of this life, and that S. Jerome and a few other furious bigots came and spoilt Christianity for centuries by making people think about fasting and penance, until at last Luther appeared and undid the mischief. He sees that asceticism means something that is at the same time very natural, very reasonable, and very like the teaching of Christ. Neither is he hard on S. Jerome for what people call his coarseness. It requires some courage in a public writer to mention the Epistle to Eustochium and not affect to shudder. M. Thierry is courageous. We have to thank him, moreover, for the almost novel light in which he places those men who have become immortal by the right of having had S. Jerome for their opponent. In a word, we have to thank him for a moderate, learned, and brilliant history of a great Saint and his times. His book, as we have said, must be read with a watchful eye; but, saving the abatements which will be easy to make, it may be read with equal profit and pleasure.

Devotions for Advent and Christmas: being a short Evening Service of Psalms, Prayers, and Hymns arranged for singing in Confraternities.

Devotions for Lent and Passiontide: being a short Evening Service, &c. &c.

AMONG the many smaller devotional works of the day not the least interesting is the set of devotions for the different ecclesiastical seasons of the year, now in course of publication, and of which two numbers have already appeared under the above titles. Each number consists of a selection of psalms, hymns, versicles, and prayers, and supplies an easy and, we think, a very attractive form of evening devotion for families and confraternities, or for popular use generally. We welcome the series as an evidence of a growing love for the Psalter—that oldest and most approved of all Catholic devotions—than which nothing perhaps will tend more to keep alive an ecclesiastical spirit in the minds of devout persons, and impart that solidity and tone to the various subjective devotions of the day, which, without some such backbone (so to say), might be apt to degenerate into the superficial and sentimental. It is well known how much these divine hymns entered into the substance of the vernacular devotions of our forefathers, both before and after the unhappy changes of the sixteenth century; and the present series may be said to be little more than a reproduction of these same materials, under a somewhat different arrangement, and in a form suited to our present wants and tastes. The adaptation of music, which is one feature of the series, naturally arises from that general love of singing which characterizes the present day, and falls in happily with the efforts now made to promote a wider cultivation of music in our schools and congregations; the good results of which, indeed, are already apparent in the popular evening services of so many of our churches. We have in the series before us the beautiful feature of psalms added to that of hymns; and as this is precisely that combination of which the Church shows us the example in her own authorized offices, we cannot well be wrong in adopting it;—more especially as it imparts considerable variety to our popular devotions,

and so helps to keep up the interest of those who join in them. We may add that everything that tends to promote a love for the Psalter, whether arranged in this or any other form, is calculated also to lead to a greater love for and appreciation of the regular offices of the Church, of which the Psalms form so large a part ; and thus the present series may be said to serve a double purpose.

A similar idea, as to a more popular use of the Psalter, seems to have been in the mind of the late Cardinal Wiseman, when he published the "Prayers for the Conversion of England." These, as our readers will see from their republication for present use by the English bishops,* consist (like the devotions of which we have been speaking) of psalms, antiphons, versicles, and prayers ; and what these "Prayers" are to the days of the week and the special purpose for which they are put forth, the present series of "Devotions" is to the various seasons, festal and penitential, of the ecclesiastical year.

It is possible, indeed, that the publication of the series before us may have had its origin in some suggestion of the Cardinal ; but whether this be so or not, they evidently fall in admirably with the view, as to books of devotion, put forth by his Eminence in one of his republished "Essays." We have said enough to draw the attention of our readers to these Devotions. We have only to add that the initials H. V. and the address (Coll. of the S. Heart, Mill Hill) will be a guarantee for the taste, judgment, and ecclesiastical spirit with which the compilation has been made ; and, lastly, that all necessary explanations as to the scope of the work, and as to its use, will be found in the numbers themselves.

The Love of Jesus, or Visits to the Blessed Sacrament, for every day in the month. By the Rev. D. GILBERT, D.D. (Omega), author of "Five Discourses on Miracles, Prayer, and the Laws of Nature." Seventh Thousand. E. J. Farrell, 13, Duke-street, Little Britain, E.C.

THE edition now before us of *The Love of Jesus* is, we believe, the first published with the name of the respected author. The fact that seven thousand copies of this little book have been called for in three years says more than any observations we could make, in proof of its adaptation to the spiritual need which it was intended to supply. It has made its way to the hearts of Catholics, by the force of its exceeding simplicity, fervour, and reality ; and it cannot fail to fulfil, in an ever-increasing measure, the end of the writer—the promotion of *true* devotion to the Blessed Sacrament.

* "Prayers for the Conversion of the People of England, and of all others separated from the Faith and Unity of the Church ; set forth by the authority of the Bishops of England, and recommended for the use of the Faithful in their several dioceses." London : Burns, Oates, & Co. 1868.

The Massacre of S. Bartholomew, preceded by a History of the Religious Wars in the Reign of Charles IX. By HENRY WHITE. With Illustrations. London : Murray. 1868.

MR. WHITE has laboured industriously at his task ; and has produced a volume which, in our opinion, will suffice to convince any impartial man that the view of the miserable affair of S. Bartholomew which we have more than once avowed, is absolutely correct. We cannot say that to us, at least, the volume is either easy or pleasant reading ; but in these days of sensational novels there ought to be many who will find it so, as it is, from first to last, a searching record of horrible crimes and outrages. Well may it be wished by every Frenchman and by every Christian that the whole of this hideous history could for ever be forgotten.

Nothing, however, can be more evident than that the wars of the reign of Charles IX. are very improperly called "religious wars." Religion had only thus far anything to do with them, that the introduction of a new religion was the occasion which divided France into two factions. Each of the parties thus divided had, we doubt not, some members who really cared about religion, but they seem to have exercised little influence upon the public acts of their respective parties. It would be an utter absurdity to consider the Hugonots a religious party, except so far as murderous hatred of the clergy, and especially of the religious of both sexes, may be called religion. On the other side, a vehement feeling of indignation necessarily filled multitudes of quiet Catholics, who saw, in every instance where the Hugonots obtained power in any part of France, their churches were desecrated, and their clergy and nuns first subjected to the most horrible torments and the most loathsome outrages, and at last murdered. But the leading men seem, on the whole, to have been wonderfully free from any such feelings. Especially the massacre of S. Bartholomew itself was evidently not the result of any strong religious feeling. Mr. White proves, as clearly as possible, that both the king, and still more the queen-mother, were all along desirous of balancing themselves between the two parties. The Duke of Guise was actuated by personal revenge. His father had been assassinated a few years before, and he and his whole party believed that Coligny had been the author of the foul deed. This, indeed, he denied ; but Mr. White says :—

"It must be confessed that the admiral's conduct and language were not altogether satisfactory. In his remarks on Poltrot's (the assassin's) interrogatory, he says that when some one declared he would kill the duke in the midst of his soldiers, he had not discouraged him (*il ne l'avait point détourné*) ; adding that he remembered well his last meeting with Poltrot, who went so far as to say that it would be easy to kill M. de Guise, and that he (Coligny) had made no reply to it, 'considering it to be mere idle talk.' In a letter to the queen-mother, which accompanied these remarks, he says : 'During the last few months I have no longer contested the matter against those who displayed such intentions, because I had information that certain persons had been practised upon to kill me. Do not imagine, however, that what I say proceeds from any regret which the duke's death occasions me. No. Far from that, I esteem it the greatest blessing that could possibly have befallen this kingdom, the Church of God, and more especially myself and all my

house.' This leaves no doubt that Coligny assented, if he did not consent, to the crime. He was not unwilling to profit by it, though he would do nothing to further it. This may lower the lofty pedestal on which some writers have placed the Protestant hero. But he was a man, and had all a man's failings, though he may have controlled them by his religious principles. Nor was assassination considered at all cowardly or dishonourable in those days, any more so than killing a man in a duel was, until very recently, among us."

When a man spoke, as Coligny does, of a most cold-blooded act of assassination, committed, not only by one of his own party, but by a man with whom he was in the habit of frequent intercourse, and who, he admits, had proposed to him the assassination, without his doing anything to dissuade it,—no one can deny that he was morally guilty, whether he had or had not, as the duke's family always believed, suborned the assassin to commit the crime by a bribe in money, of which there seems, to say the least, no evidence. Be this as it may, there is no doubt that the spirit of revenge excited in the Guise family and party by this assassination was the real cause of the massacre of S. Bartholomew, in which the murdered duke's son was the chief agent.

Mr. White shows that the massacre was not on the part even of Catharine de Medici premeditated, and that the king, at least, was drawn into it by being persuaded of the reality of a Hugonot plot for the murder of himself, his family, and friends. There is no reason to believe that such a plot really was ready to break out; but it is certain that the whole conduct of the Hugonot party for years before had made it so probable, that a youth like Charles might very easily indeed be deluded into believing it. Indeed, it is likely that Catharine, by whom he was misled, herself believed it. That it proceeded from no religious zeal, their characters sufficiently prove. Mr. White compares it with the Sicilian Vespers, the murder of the Danes by the Saxons (whom he strangely confuses with the Britons, and calls by that name) in England, and that of the Romans in Asia, under Mithridates, and says:—

"These massacres, however condemnable, were committed in the name of freedom—to drive out a foreign conqueror, to throw off the yoke of the invader. But the massacre of S. Bartholomew arose out of the paliest and most selfish motives. Envy, jealousy, greediness—such were the motives of Catharine, of Anjou, and of their councillors. The plea of religion was never put forward, though it is a plea too often employed to extenuate what cannot be justified."

The whole tragedy bears a wonderful resemblance to other sad periods of the history of France, to the times of the great Revolution, and still more to those of the contests between the Orleans and Burgundian factions, under Charles VI. Nothing is more carefully to be avoided than imputations upon nations which are so often made upon totally insufficient evidence, and are the meanest indulgence of narrow-minded prejudice. And yet, remembering this, the crimes of these three periods so much resemble each other, that it is impossible not to suspect that national character had really a great deal to do in suggesting them.

Another consideration which this volume forces upon us is that the so-called "Reformation" in England would never have succeeded, if an unfortunate concurrence of circumstances had not thrown the royal power wholly on its side ; nor even so, unless the royal power had been at the moment most unusually and exceptionally absolute. It is impossible not to see that the Hugonots were at least as numerous in France as were the Puritans of England under Henry, Edward, or even Elizabeth. It was one of those outbreaks of Satan which have often taken place ; and if the State had supported the Church instead of opposing her, we doubt not the next generation would have looked back upon it with quite as little sympathy as Frenchmen of the seventeenth century did upon the Hugonots. The political interest of Elizabeth seemed almost to compel her, as a worldly politician, to throw herself against her will into the Puritan party ; and the real and imminent danger of Spanish conquest made the mass of the nation associate her success with the maintenance of the national independence and liberty. Thus she was enabled to make the public ministration and preaching of the Church absolutely impossible for so many years, that more than one generation grew up under the tradition ; and thus Protestantism became the hereditary religion of England, and associated in the minds of the mass of the English people with the national interests and national glory. In France the Protestant party seems to have been for the moment quite as strong ; but the Church, though in many respects hampered, was not actually debarred from all possibility of addressing herself to the people : and the result was that the next generation was Catholic. But for the unhappy massacre of S. Bartholomew, there is every reason to believe that all succeeding generations of Frenchmen would have thought of the Hugonots only as of men equally the enemies of Christianity and of their country. One thing is plain, that there was no crime so horrible that they hesitated a moment to commit it. It may be questioned whether any faction, stained by the habitually repeated practice of outrages so detestable, ever existed in any Christian land.

Mr. White begins by telling us that "laymen who venture into such subjects [as the internal development of the Reformed Church] rarely escape the imputation of ignorance and heterodoxy," and that he has therefore avoided it. It is to be regretted that, notwithstanding this, he usually writes in the tone of a bitter and excited partisan. Not content with always assuming that the Hugonots were the only religious party, and that the Catholics were merely slaves of the basest superstition, he allows himself to indulge freely in terms of mere abuse. Thus when he writes to say that people who passed the sacred image at the corners of the streets were subjected to the suspicion of heresy, he says, "If any one refused to take off his hat as he passed, or to put money into the alms-box before the shrine, some dirty priest or monk would raise the cry of 'heretic,' and the poor Reformed would be pelted, beaten, and perhaps dragged through the mire to prison." This mere abuse of all the Catholic clergy is in the style of a bygone day. Last century it would have been nothing peculiar : it is now really unusual. It is impossible, of course, to take any fact for granted without careful inquiry, merely on the authority of a man who thus writes in

the style of an extreme party pamphlet, not in that of history. We have found several instances in the volume, in which, we doubt not, a little inquiry could show that Mr. White has been totally misled by the intensity of his anti-Catholic prejudices.

The Life of S. Francis of Assisi, from the Legenda Sancti Francisci of S. Bonaventure. By the author of "The Life of Saint Teresa," "The Life of the Curé of Ars," &c., with a Preface by His Grace the ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. London : Washbourne. 1868.

THIS is a first-rate translation by one of the very few persons who have the art of translating as if they were writing an original work ; a talent more rare than that of original writing, if we may judge from the exceedingly execrable translations which we almost always meet with. As to the work itself, we can hardly venture to add anything to what the Archbishop has said in his very short preface :—

"The Life of a Saint written by a Saint, as the Life of Saint Paul of the Cross, written by his companion the B. Strambi, speaks to the heart with a vital power, which no work of merely natural genius can command. It has a twofold operation of the Spirit of God with it, both in the subject and in the writer. Such is, in an eminent degree, the life of S. Francis by S. Bonaventure — the life of the Seraphic Patriarch written by the Seraphic Doctor. Among uninspired books there are few that breathe more sensibly the love of God. There is a light and a sweetness about it which are not of this world. The anecdote of S. Thomas visiting S. Bonaventure's cell, and finding him in ecstasy, is too well known to need recital. S. Bonaventure was then writing the life of S. Francis, and it was on these very pages that he was intent when S. Thomas drew back from the door, saying, 'Let us leave a Saint to work for a Saint.' It is in the same spirit of love and reverence that we ought to read this book."

The translator has thrown over the narrative just the least *soupçon* of an antiquated style, which, without rendering it the least less easy and pleasant to read, even out loud, is singularly well suited to the date and to the simplicity of the original. The printer and bookseller have done their parts excellently, and have given us a little volume as pretty as it is valuable.

Catechism and Instructions for Confession. 1866.

THIS little work by the Hon. Mrs. Kavanagh is intended to supply a want often felt by parents who have to instruct their children for the Sacrament of Penance, especially in cases where, owing to distance from any mission or family circumstances, they cannot obtain for them the advantage of frequent instruction by a priest.

The difficulty and labour involved in a work can be very imperfectly judged of by what there is to show for them, and it would be hard to

exaggerate the difficulty of composing a really good Catechism. We shall not therefore be passing a very severe criticism on the present work, if we say that while some points are clearly and well put, it does not seem to us that the authoress has succeeded perfectly. Thus, no mention is made of the necessity of jurisdiction for the valid administration of the Sacrament; so that a child who had perfectly learned and understood a Catechism devoted exclusively to instruction on this one subject and naturally expected to be full and complete, might remain under the impression that any priest could confess and absolve him. Again, in answer to the question, "What is a bad thought?" we are told "An imagination which brings to our mind something which it would be a sin to do" (p. 21). But a bad thought may be an imagination of something which is not an action at all; for instance, a revengeful person might take delight in imagining an enemy in a condition of suffering or humiliation;—a proud or vain man might sin by thoughts of pride or vanity, without any reference to any imagined action; and it would be easy to apply the same remark to the matter of the sextum preeceptum. No Catechism, however carefully drawn up, can supply the place of oral instruction; but it ought to be accurate as far as it goes. It is certainly not easy to secure, in a thoroughly satisfactory degree, the desirable union of clearness, brevity, and accuracy, without a scientific knowledge of theology.

Nevertheless, Mrs. Kavanagh's little book will be serviceable to parents, and we trust in a future edition it may be made more perfect.

Tales from the Diary of a Sister of Mercy. By C. M. BRAME.

THE Tales from the Diary of, we conclude, an imaginary Sister of Mercy, are told with a considerable degree of spirit and, occasionally, of pathos. *The Cross and the Crown* is, we think, beautiful, and there are several touching narratives of women's devoted affection to (we know not why) almost invariably good-for-nothing husbands. There is indeed but one exception, in the case of a man killed within a few weeks of his marriage. If this be a real diary, the fact is a melancholy one. In a work of fiction, it would bespeak a lack of invention and an inartistic deficiency in variety. This uniform moral deformity in the men is accompanied by an equal uniformity in the personal loveliness of the women. We have no description of Sister Magdalen herself; but she has the singular good fortune never to come across any person of her own sex, religious or secular, who might not have been chosen as an illustration for Heath's Book of Beauty. In seven out of the eight tales (the exception being that of the *Priest's death*), we have seven beautiful women, the only relief to their uniformity being the alternation of dark violet with soft brown eyes, clusters of golden with masses of glossy black hair, both retaining their brightness and beauty in the lowest depth of poverty and destitution. Pity it is that a writer, who is evidently a good Catholic, and who has both the will and the power to do good, should have weakened the effect of her book by writing (as Hotspur says) "so like a waiting gentlewoman." The first tale, *The Double Marriage*, is unfortunately

by far the worst, and we confess to having felt a strong temptation to close the book at the page where the dying, despairing, but yet lovely young lady, on her hospital bed, describes her first ball-dress to the patient ear of good Sister Magdalen. We persevered, however, and we strongly advise our readers to do the same. They will find much that is good and true in this little book, in spite of blemishes, which arise, we believe, from a prevalent but most mistaken idea that piety and Catholicism want rose-coloured curtains to set them off. We would earnestly recommend our Catholic writers of fiction to study *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, and see what a master's hand can make of a plain Presbyterian heroine.

Letter in the Tablet of February 1st, signed "A ROMAN DOCTOR OF DIVINITY."

IN this letter the "Roman Doctor" explains his meaning on one or two points on which we have misunderstood him. We accept, of course, most unreservedly his own testimony as to what he intended to say; but at the same time we are of opinion that in each case our own interpretation of his language was the more obvious, and the more objectively legitimate.

He begins by referring to our "pugnacious attitude." Now, nothing could be *less* pugnacious than our original reference to his letter (Oct. 1867, p. 358); whereas his reply (which our readers can see in our last number, pp. 270-271) was most aggressive and overbearing. This way of writing produces many evil results. One of these is, that in some cases the respondent is almost necessitated to assume a "pugnacious attitude," lest he should be misapprehended as holding his own opinion with any kind of hesitation.

We will now take in order the writer's various explanations.

1. We understood him to maintain in far the larger portion of his July letter, that the Church's infallibility is limited to her testification of immediately revealed dogmata. "The strict limit of infallibility," he said, "is the Deposit." He now explains that, had he meant what we supposed, he would have expressed it differently; he would have said that "the limit of infallibility is the strict Deposit." He explains, accordingly, that he accounts the Church's infallibility as extending to the "virtual" Deposit; to "those truths which flow by necessary consequence from revealed dogmata."

We really do not understand how the location of the word "strict" materially affects the meaning of the above-quoted sentence; but on that matter we will not insist. It is the fifth paragraph of his July letter which, as we thought, unmistakably fixed his meaning. If the Church is infallible in all "those truths which flow by necessary consequence from revealed dogmata," she can in every century infallibly teach new deductions from the Faith once given; deductions which at an earlier period had never been thought of. For ourselves, of course, we heartily admit this; but we thought it was the very thing which our opponent intended to deny. He emphatically endorses

the opinion that the Pope "cannot appoint anything to be believed *which was not believed before.*" Where there is question of infallible decrees, "it can only be as to whether such doctrine *hath always been taught . . .* that the inquiry is directed ; the power is never exercised . . . for imposing on the faith of the Catholic one single new doctrine, *which has not till then been universally received.*" Our opponent quoted these words with the warmest approval, as expressing the very position which he intended to maintain against us. Yet language has lost all meaning, unless they peremptorily limit infallibility within the sphere of the "strict," the "actual" Deposit. Nay, they limit it still *more* stringently ; though we need not enlarge on this. At all events they *deny* the Church's infallibility as to the "virtual" Deposit, and *confine* it within the "actual." How were we to guess that nothing could be further than this from the "Roman Doctor's" intention ?

2. Our opponent next explains himself in regard to those propositions, which are *injurious* indeed to the Faith, but yet not *contradictory* to any portion, either of the actual or the virtual Deposit. He holds that the Church can infallibly condemn such propositions as "rash and dangerous," but not as *untrue*. It would never have occurred to us that he could hold so very singular a position ; nor will our readers be surprised that the very notion of his doing so never crossed our mind.

3. He entirely disavows another opinion which we ascribed to him ; viz., that "the Pontiff sometimes speaks authoritatively, though not infallibly, on matters wholly unconnected with the Deposit." On this matter, however, he frankly admits that his language was open to misconception. He only "blame us so far, that it would have been more courteous not to suppose that he had taken leave of his senses altogether."

4. Our opponent explains his view concerning the Church's infallibility on such questions as those at issue between ontologists and psychologists. He admits that the Church has "abundantly condemned"—and infallibly too—"certain ontological and psychological tenets." But he thinks that she has not condemned, and indeed cannot condemn, that philosophy "which gives an objective account of the necessary principles of human reason." This is of course not the place for attempting any kind of argument on this question. The misunderstanding between the "Roman Doctor" and ourselves arose from the circumstance, that (as we mention in another part of our present number) we use the term "ontologism" in a far narrower sense than that which he assigns to it. But under the full light of his present explanation, we are still quite unable to understand his original objection to our statement that the Church is infallible on such questions as those between ontologism and psychologism, so far as she pronounces on them at all.

A Letter to W. G. Ward, Esq., D. Ph., on his Theory of Infallible Instruction. By H. F. D. RYDER, of the Oratory. London : Longmans.

A Second Letter to the Rev. F. Ryder. By W. G. WARD, D. Ph. London : Burns & Oates.

WE must not leave unrecorded the appearance of these two pamphlets ; but it is difficult to know what comment we may most appropriately make on their contents. It will be best, perhaps, to take the opportunity for considering two objections which have been felt by some Catholics, against the discussion on infallibility having been commenced at all.

It has been thought then by some, that the DUBLIN REVIEW is not the fit arena for discussing a purely theological question, which belongs exclusively to the schools. We have often replied to this opinion ; but as it is still occasionally expressed, we will repeat what we have already said. Pius IX. has denounced certain "principal errors of this our most unhappy age." These errors are by no means chiefly in the region of pure theology, but rather of philosophy and religious politics. Is it, or is it not, the indispensable duty of a Catholic periodical to bear its part in duly contending against those errors ? Every loyal Catholic will answer in the affirmative. But if these errors have been *infallibly* condemned, it is impossible to contend duly against them without calling emphatic attention to that circumstance. Now Pius IX. states in the "Quantâ curâ," that his organs for condemning them have been Encyclicals, Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters. It is impossible therefore duly to contend against these errors, unless full justice be done to the infallibility of Doctrinal Apostolic Letters. And this view is corroborated by the most obvious facts. Take any Catholic periodical you please, English or foreign : you will find, either that it has advocated a doctrine of infallibility substantially identical with our own ; or else that it has not attempted any sustained polemic against the errors denounced by Pius IX., so far as those errors prevail among Catholics.

Here, however, in order to prevent possible misunderstanding, we must interpose an explanation. By far the most important point at issue between F. Ryder and Dr. Ward turns on a question entirely distinct from that of Apostolic Letters. For F. Ryder alleges that no obligation is imposed on all Catholics of accepting as infallible the Church's condemnation of propositions as "erroneous," "close upon heresy," "blasphemous," "impious," &c., &c.

There is a second difficulty in the matter, felt by some Catholics for whom we feel the sincerest respect. These excellent men fully understand how one Catholic may usefully controvert with another on some matter admitted on both sides to be perfectly open. But in this case one party denies that the other's position is *permitted* to a Catholic at all. "Is not this allegation," ask these objectors, "a wanton disturbance of the Church's peace ?"

The general question of such Catholic controversies—their advantages and their evils, and the circumstances which call for them—deserves a detailed treatment, which we hope to give it in an early number. Here we will but speak of the case before us. We have undoubtedly alleged that F. Ryder—

however confessedly excellent his motives and intentions—does in fact materially violate a grave obligation imposed by the Holy Father on all Catholics ; and, moreover, threatens the Faith with grievous injury. It would be a very serious offence to adduce such a charge, except under a profound sense of responsibility. It would also be a serious offence—even supposing duty to require the allegation of that charge—to indulge in any kind of bitterness, violence, or invective. We humbly trust that we have committed neither of these serious offences ; but it is not for us to pronounce with any confidence in our own favour.

Dr. Ward's second Letter is so intimately mixed up with a general course of articles in this Review, that we have thought it better, for the accommodation of our readers, to append the whole at the end of our number.*

Letter to the Tablet of March 21st. By Rev. F. RYDER.

WE wish to notice one sentence of this letter, because it involves a most serious misapprehension of the doctrine on infallibility for which we have throughout contended. F. Ryder understands us as “admitting that the Church is not infallible in certain portions of her instruction ; viz., where she instructs indirectly.” On the contrary, we should never dream of making such an admission. In October last (pp. 360–365) we maintained it to be an integral portion of the Faith, that the Church is infallible in her whole magisterium ; and if in her whole magisterium, then inclusively in her whole doctrinal instruction, direct and indirect. Whatever she intends to *teach*, she teaches (we maintain) infallibly. We consider this doctrine to be vital.

F. Ryder's mistake apparently arises from our admission that the preamble arguments and obiter dicta of a doctrinal decree are commonly—the obiter dicta universally—liable to error. But the reason of this admission is, that they are no part of the Church's doctrinal instruction. A doctrinal “obiter dictum” means precisely—as we understand the matter—doctrinal proposition, which she incidentally *expresses* without intending to *teach* it.

It might be inferred from F. Ryder's language, that we look on the thing as a matter of grammar ; that we account the Church infallible in what she expresses *directly*, but fallible in what she expresses *obliquely*. Nothing can be further from our thought. It does not matter in what way the Church may express or imply, that a certain doctrine is obligatory on the unreserved interior assent of Catholics. Every such doctrine, we maintain, is infallibly

* We may here be permitted to correct a little oversight in Dr. Ward's letter, which he accidentally observed after its publication. In p. 35 he parallels Card. Antonelli's letter to the bishops with an imaginary letter addressed by S. Titus to all the churches founded by S. Paul ; and in this imaginary letter he speaks of “various epistles and orations delivered” by S. Paul “*in his Apostolic character*.” The words here italicised should be omitted, as there is nothing precisely corresponding to them in Card. Antonelli's letter. It will be found that the *argument* is wholly unaffected by this omission ; indeed, its exact force will be thereby more distinctly seen.

true. It is the business of Catholics, in the case of any given doctrinal Act, to examine carefully the context and circumstances, with the view of discovering what are the various doctrines which the Church therein lays down as binding on their interior assent.

As we are going to press, we receive the current number of the "Revue des Sciences Ecclésiastiques" (Paris, Cretté. It is dated "March," appearing at the end of that month). We most heartily recommend to our readers an admirable article, written by F. Montrouzier, S.J., on "the Doctrinal Authority of the *Syllabus*."

NOTE TO THE ARTICLE ON RITUALISM.

THIS article was in print some time before judgment was given by the Dean of Arches in the two Ritualistic suits,—Flamank *v.* Simpson and Martin *v.* Mackonochie. The judgment itself and the manner in which it has been received have exactly answered our expectations. Sir R. Phillimore decides that three of the four practices in dispute are unlawful in the Church of England; viz., the elevation of the bread and wine; the mixture of water with the wine as part of the service; and the use of incense. The fourth, viz., the lighting of two candles upon the communion-table during the Communion service—not for light, but for symbol—he decides to be legalized by the injunctions of Edward VI. The reading of the judgment took four hours and a half; it was very learned and elaborate, and the feelings of the judge were evidently in favour of the Ritualists. He threw overboard the principle that any point of ritual was to be condemned because it was used before the change of religion; and that long disuse was a ground for pronouncing it to be illegal—nay, even that a practice is necessarily illegal because it is not ordered in any rubric; all these were concessions to the Ritualists. He even declared his own feeling to be in favour of incense and the mixture of the water, while he felt himself forced to declare them illegal. He also repudiated the idea that he was deciding any point of doctrine. On the whole, the judgment was accepted by the Ritualists, and Mr. Mackonochie writes to the Bishop of London that "a judgment conceived in such a spirit of deep and true Catholicity will do more than anything to calm the minds of those who have been much troubled by many past events," and that he has "decided to abide by it, without appeal to the higher Court, unless compelled to do so by any act of the promoter." The Ritualist newspapers adopt a similar tone. It is said, however, that the "Church Association" and "Low-Church Society" intend to appeal against the sentence authorizing the two candles. Mr. Mackonochie draws a wholly unfounded distinction in calling the Court of Arches "the highest Court which claims spiritual authority," and the Committee of Council "a civil tribunal." Both equally are civil as to the source of their authority; both equally spiritual as to the extent of their jurisdiction.

LETTER ON PROFESSOR UBAGHS AND ONTOLOGISM.

[The following letter is occupied with two matters essentially distinct from each other. Firstly, our correspondent thinks that our January statement of facts on the Louvain philosophical controversy is imperfect, and does insufficient justice to the docility and loyalty of Professor Ubaghs. Nothing can have been further from our intention than to imply the slightest suspicion of that docility and loyalty; and we are very glad to publish the additional facts furnished by "Vindex," corroborative of our own impression.

But, secondly, "Vindex" accounts us mistaken in considering (January, p. 236, note) that ontologism has been condemned by the Church. Now we really doubt whether there is any difference whatever between our correspondent and ourselves, on the scope of the Pontifical decrees. The doctrine which we understand to have been condemned is, that God in this life is immediately presented to the soul as an Object of intuition. But the doctrine advocated by "Vindex" is, that man's "perception" of God is "conditional and mediate." On this head indeed we desire greater clearness in "Vindex's" letter. We should have been glad if he had explained more precisely what that "perception" of God can be, which on the one hand is "mediate," and yet on the other hand is not given "through intermediate ideas" but "through intelligible ideas which reside in God's Essence, and manifest Him *ad extra* to the mind." But "Vindex" seems to intend that the mind has no immediate perception of God, or of that which is really identical with God. And if such be his meaning, we do not for a moment allege that his views are inconsistent with the Church's teaching.

The question at issue between him and ourselves seems mainly one of words. We have ourselves always been of the opinion expressed by Herr Schütz (see our January number, pp. 235-6), that the system, called ontologism by Catholic ontologists, teaches this immediate perception of God. It was in this sense we said that ontologism had, in our humble opinion, been absolutely condemned by the Church.

Even if we differed from our correspondent far more widely than we do on the bearing of the recent decisions, we should have had still much pleasure in inserting his letter. In the present day especially—with a Catholic University looming in the distance—it is of vital importance that Catholics shall know what are those philosophical tenets which the Church has condemned, and what are those which she has *not* condemned. We consider ourselves, therefore, to be doing a great public service, so far as we procure a hearing for any thoughtful Catholic who, while firmly persuaded of the Church's *infallibility* in such condemnations, may have an opinion of his own as to what they precisely are.]

To the Editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW.

SIR,—Will you kindly insert in the next number of the DUBLIN REVIEW the following exact translation of a letter of Professor Ubaghs, and some

notes of my own, on the events of the Louvain controversy, and on the question of the condemnation of ontologism. The former is an important addition to the documents published in your January number; the latter will, I hope, contribute in some degree to place some important points in a truer light.

I.—LETTER OF M. URGHES TO HIS EMINENCE THE CARDINAL
ARCHEBISHOP OF MALINES.

I proceed before everything else to confirm by writing the declaration which I had the honour to make to you by word of mouth, of my entire and absolute submission to the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of the Index in 1843 and 1844, and to that of their Eminences the Cardinals of the Index and of the Holy Office united, September 21st, 1864, with a formal promise to conform myself exactly to the three decrees.

In the next place, without desiring to limit or weaken in any way this complete submission, I have the honour to transmit to your Eminence the explanations which I begged to be allowed to present in order to justify my good faith, and to show that if, for twenty years, I have not fulfilled the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, it has not been through want of respect and submission to the judgments of the Roman Congregations, but solely because, up to the moment when the decree of September 21st, 1864, was made known to me, I most sincerely believed that I had conformed to them.

I declare first of all, and in precise terms, that on that point I have been deceived: the two Congregations united having decided that I had not conformed, there can no longer be any doubt about it; accordingly, there is none in my own thoughts, or in my interior conviction. My explanations, then, have for their sole object to show that during twenty years I have been in an error absolutely involuntary, and that I have never experienced the least hesitation in my sentiments of respectful and entire submission to the commands, the counsels, and the wishes of the Holy See—a submission which I consider the first duty of every Catholic.

That you may be able to judge as to my good faith, your Eminence will permit me to recall certain facts, and to cite certain documents.

In the month of September, 1843, my friend Count Van der Vrecken, who during the summer had made a journey to Rome, informed me in private conversation that my works had been accused before the Sacred Congregation of the Index. Fearing that my principles might have been unfaithfully set forth, I took steps to secure the heads of the accusation being communicated to me, that I might thus be enabled to furnish explanations. Two months later I received from the Secretary of State, his Eminence Cardinal Lambruschini, through the medium of his Excellency the Apostolic Nuncio and your Most Reverend Eminence, the five propositions contained in the decree of June 23, 1843.

The document communicated did not include the words: "Observationes S. Indicis Congregationis, diei 23 Junii, 1843. Rev. D. Ubaghs in sua Theodicea, et interdum etiam in Logica, subsequentes propositiones docet, quas S. Congregatio Indicis praesposita emendandas esse judicat." Neither did it contain the following words: "Haec sunt praecipuae sententiae que in predicto libro corrigendae videntur. Monet igitur S. Congregatio Rev. Auctorem, ut nova aliqua editione librum suum emendandum curet, atque interim in scholasticis suis lectionibus ab iis sententiis docendis velit." The document forwarded to me merely says: "Docet auctor in Theodicea et

interdum etiam in Logica seqq. propositiones," and gives the five propositions.

On receiving this communication, I felt it to be my duty to furnish explanations and elucidations on the subject of these five propositions. I believed that the Sacred Congregation of the Index, having regard to my position of professor in the Catholic University of Louvain, had deigned to apply to me section 10 of the Constitution of Benedict XIV. *Solicita ac provida*, and had resolved not to pass a definitive judgment before having heard me. In this conviction I hastened to draw up an *explanatory* and *justificatory* memoir, which your Eminence kindly consented to forward to Rome. Such a *memoir*, in the face of a judgment which I should have considered definitive, would have been on my part a want of respect. It was not thus that the Sacred Congregation viewed it. It condescended to accept my explanations favourably, as witness a letter of Monseigneur Pecci, Apostolic Nuncio at Brussels. This letter accompanied the communication of the decree of 1844, and was transmitted to me by your Eminence. The tenor of it is as follows :—

"Brussels, Apostolic Nunciature, No. 227.

" MOST REVEREND EMINENCE,—I have received from Rome the answer which was expected with impatience in regard to the works of Professor Ubachs. Although the explanations which he had sent have been highly appreciated, nevertheless it has been thought that it would be prudent and necessary to introduce in the new impression the corrections indicated in the sheet which has been sent to me by the Secretary of State, and which I have the honour to remit herewith to your Most Reverend Eminence, in order that it may deign to have it forwarded to the above-mentioned professor, with an injunction to consent in his new publication to conform himself to the wishes that have been made known by the Sacred Congregation, in such manner as his principles of religion and probity shall determine ; above all, when he has to speak of that most essential point, that is to say, of the existence of God.

" In bringing under the knowledge of your Most Reverend Eminence the issue of this affair, I have been charged by his Eminence the Secretary of State to declare that it has been precisely in consideration of the earnestness and the most honourable recommendations of your Eminence, that efforts have been made to have the expected judgment pronounced as soon as possible, in order, in the next place, to make the necessary communication of it without delay.

" In thus discharging the orders which have been given me, I have the honour, &c.

" (Signed)  J. Archbishop of Damietta, Apostolic Nuncio.

" Brussels, 23rd September, 1844."

As soon as I had received the decree of 1844, which this letter was sent with, I hastened to prepare a new edition of the Logic and the Theodicea, introducing into it the corrections which I considered necessary to meet the wishes of the Sacred Congregation of the Index.

These corrections were not all that was required. This point has now been definitively decided. But up to the moment when I became aware of the decree of September 21, 1864, I most sincerely believed that they were. I beg your Eminence to permit me to enter here into some details.

The facts which I have recalled show how I was led to consider the decree of 1844 as the only definitive decree issued in my regard. As to this decree,

it includes the following expressions, among others :—“Pauca quædam loca in opere quod a Cl. viro G. C. Ubaghs anno 1844 Lovaniæ editum est, et inscribitur Theodiceæ seu Theologie naturalis elementa, adnotanda esse videntur, ut doctissimus auctor, additis quibusdam illustrationibus, obortas circa ejusdem operis intelligentiam difficultates e medio tollere possit. . . . In his omnibus mens doctissimi auctoris paulo clarius explicanda videtur, ne quis inde occasionem sumat vim elevandi argumentorum quæ Dei existentiam demonstrant. . . . Plura alia ejusdem generis ibi obvia sunt, quæ contra mentem auctoris forte in alienos sensus torqueri possent.” These terms led me to suppose that the Sacred Congregation had not intended to point out to me errors of doctrine to be corrected, or false principles to be relinquished, but that it only demanded elucidations and explanations suited to cause my ideas to be better understood. This accounts for the language which I used in the preface of my Logic, in 1844, and in a recent letter to his Eminence Cardinal Altieri, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Index.

In 1845 I sent to Monseigneur Pecci, the Apostolic Nuncio, two copies of the new edition of the Logic and Theodicea, praying his Excellency to have them forwarded to Rome, in order that the Sacred Congregation might be able to judge whether the additions and changes introduced fully corresponded with the wishes which it had expressed. At different times I received assurances which convinced me that I had done all that had been demanded of me. The documents to which I allude not having been approved by the Sacred Congregation, and, above all, by the Sovereign Pontiff, have no value except to justify my good faith, and it is with this view only that I refer to them. Among these documents, allow me to transcribe here the letter which the Very Rev. P. Degola, Secretary of the Congregation of the Index, addressed to me in 1846. It is as follows :—

“REVERENDE DOMINE,

“Quanquam scio id tibi ab aliis jam nuntiatum, quod ego his litteris dicturus sum, attamen ut postulationi tue, necnon Emi. Card. prefecti mandato morem geram, libenter significo, declarationes illas atque varietates, quas monente S. Congregatione in novissima tuorum operum *Logicæ ac Theodiceæ* editione fideliter abundanterque effecisti, voto ac sententia ejusdem S. Congregationis prorsus respondisse. Quam ob rem docilitati tue, prout par est, gratulor, et ut de sacris humanisque doctrinis, pro tuo excellenti ingenio et religione, bene mereri pergas, plurimum opto. Vale.

“Rome Kal. Septembris, 1846.

“Humill. devotis. servus

“FR. TH. ANTONINUS DEGOLA, O. P.

“S. C. I. Secret.”

Finally, I declare again, I shall take the greatest care to conform scrupulously to the decrees that have emanated from the Holy See, and I shall exert myself to correct my works as soon as possible according to the prescriptions of those decrees.

I trust, Most Reverend Eminence, that the explanations which I have now made will suffice to show that I have never varied in my sentiments of absolute submission to the decrees of the Apostolic See, the oracle of truth.

As your Eminence has been charged to communicate to me the decrees mentioned above, I shall be happy if you would deign also to act as a means for bringing to the feet of the Vicar of Jesus Christ the expression of my most respectful and most complete submission.

Be pleased to accept, Monseigneur, the homage of the sentiments of profound respect with which I have the honour to be

Your Eminence's
Most humble and most obedient servant,
(Signed) G. C. Ubaghs.

Louvain, November 14, 1864.

II. I will make no comments on the above letter, but only add a sentence from the decree of 1864, which confirms its purport. "We must indeed confess," writes Cardinal Patrizi, "that after the year 1844 some acts intervened in which praise was bestowed on the aforesaid Doctor of Louvain, precisely as if, in the later editions of his work, he had obeyed the desire and judgment of the Sacred Congregation," &c. (See *DUBLIN REVIEW*, Jan. 1868, p. 283.) This, as well as the letter, shows that Professor Ubaghs had been misled, and clears him of the charge of being "incorrigible," &c.

After the events of 1843-6, recorded above, many years passed with nothing more than perhaps an unusual amount of contention between the rival schools of philosophy. But in 1859, the publication of the work of Canon Lupus, of Liège, entitled, "Traditionalism and Rationalism examined," &c., and the declaration of an eminent Roman theologian that no sincere Catholic could hold the opinions of the Louvain professors, and other proceedings, drove four of them, viz. MM. Beelen, Lefebvre, Ubaghs, and Laforet, "to submit the doctrine taught in their writings to the judgment of the Sacred Congregation of the Index." Accordingly they drew up an exposition of their teaching on the point in dispute, which was the necessity of social instruction to enable man to attain to the first practical knowledge of the metaphysical and moral truths, or to the use of reason, and addressed it to the Sacred Congregation through the Card. Prefect de Andrea, Feb. 1, 1860. Unfortunately Card. Andrea did not, at first, bring the matter formally before the whole Congregation, but instead only referred it to several Consultors, and then replied, March 2, that there was nothing to prohibit the professors from continuing to hold their doctrine. The consequence was that his letter was denied by the opponents of the professors to have any authority, and served only to embitter the dispute.

In the following year, July 31, the Belgian bishops sent a letter to the Rector of the University of Louvain, with a view to restore peace, and the professors engaged to adhere to all the counsels and rules laid down for them, without exception. We are also told that certain of the Belgian bishops now "besought the Holy See to pronounce on the question." The Apostolical Letter of Dec. 19, 1861, makes no allusion to such a request, but refers to instructions of the Holy See, in obedience to which the bishops had assembled in July, and sent the letter before mentioned. Whatever the truth may be, Pius IX. made no pronouncement, but, reserving the final decision, forbade all parties to qualify their own doctrine as alone true, &c.

Meanwhile other events of importance had taken place. The duty of examining the doctrine of the Louvain professors had been assigned to the Congregations of the Holy Office and the Index united; Card. de Andrea had resigned his post of Prefect of the latter Congregation; and, lastly, the

famous seven propositions had been declared by the Holy Office to be "unsafe teaching." (See *Annales de Phil. Chrét.*, March, 1862.)

The Louvain professors rejoiced at the Apostolic Letter of Dec. 19, and also publicly expressed their regret at having contributed to sadden the Holy Father's heart by being parties to a controversy which had caused him pain. Had they foreseen this result, they said, they would have borne the accusations alleged against them in silence. (*Rev. Cath. de Louvain*, 1862, p. 66.) The Card. Archbishop of Malines also, in a letter to the Pope, dated June 12, 1862, spoke of the professors in terms of the highest praise, and in their name renewed the profession of obedience which they had made to the Belgian bishops. (See *ibid.*, pp. 417-427.)

The next event of any consequence is the letter of Card. Patrizi, of Oct. 11th, 1864, which was followed by the letter, given above, of Professor Ubaghs. In obedience to that act the latter proceeded straightway to correct his works, and in 1865 was able to place copies of his Logic and Theodicea in the hands of the Belgian bishops and of the Roman authorities, there to undergo a fresh examination and judgment, meaning to publish them "as soon as" he "should have obtained from Rome the assurance that" his "corrections were sufficient." It has been asserted indeed that "the Professor seemed incorrigible, and brought out another edition of this unhappy Theodicea in 1865," without having first submitted it for judgment: but I think this most serious accusation is now disposed of. No evidence whatever can be brought to support it.

To continue the history: the new edition of Professor Ubaghs' works failed to obtain the desired approval, and on March 2nd, 1866, there was issued another decree, more comprehensive than that of 1864, inasmuch as it referred to all his philosophical works, and to other points in them, besides those previously adverted to. This decree declares that in the works in question are taught doctrines very similar (*plane similes*) to some of the seven propositions pronounced unsafe in 1861. Which doctrines these are, and how many, or which of the obnoxious propositions they resemble, the decree does not state; neither does it make any mention of ontologism. It further declares that "there is no doubt that Professor Ubaghs, considering his great virtue, and the other professors of Louvain, who adhere to the same opinions, will obey this decision." This sentence comes from the highest authority, and makes it manifest that the persons named had not hitherto done or said anything inconsistent with the most perfect submission to the Holy See. So far, then, the charge of being "incorrigible, tortuous, intellectually immovable," &c. &c., has no foundation.

On the receipt of this last decree, the Belgian bishops sent a letter to the Rector and Professors of Louvain, March 21st, to which they all replied, and gladly gave a declaration "of filial obedience to be laid at the feet of His Holiness." Moreover, Professor Ubaghs, at the desire of the bishops, resigned his chair, and began "to devote his leisure to the correction of his works," and his name is no more mentioned in connection with these transactions.

But still some difficulty arose with regard to the interpretation of the late decree. It was said that the decree was disciplinary, not doctrinal, and

there were persons who thought that they might still privately hold the doctrines which had been disapproved of; while others considered that the exposition of doctrine submitted by the four professors in 1860 was not touched by the decision. M. Laforet deemed this last opinion probable and lawful, as also Professor Beelen; and Professor Lefebve wrote to the same effect to the Bishop of Namur, who, in conjunction with two other bishops, sent the letter to the Holy See. The Cardinal of Malines also communicated to Card. Patrizi the knowledge of the doubts about the force of the decree, and the latter replied by a command to the bishops to meet and take measures to secure a full, perfect, and absolute submission of those professors who adhered to the opinions censured, to the decision of the Holy See. Pursuant to these directions, the bishops assembled at the end of July, and cited MM. Beelen and Lefebve to state their sentiments. They did so at length, affirming explicitly that they embraced all the decisions of the Holy See with their whole hearts, but that it was not manifest to them, from the letters of March 2nd and June 3rd, that the exposition of 1860 was included in the decision. Some of the bishops expressed a contrary belief, for they thought that the letter of Card. Patrizi, of June 3rd, made it certain that the doctrine concerning the development of human reason was condemned. From this we may, I think, infer that others of the bishops (one half of the six) were at least in doubt on that point. But all the bishops were agreed in their conviction that the two professors would submit perfectly "to every decree of the Holy See the moment it became known to them," and they requested the two professors to furnish a distinct statement of their opinion, to be submitted for judgment at Rome. A doctrinal statement on the necessity of instruction was accordingly drawn up, and a request made to be taught whether it was *theologically* condemned, and to be utterly rejected by every Catholic; and the bishops therefore prayed the Holy See "to declare whether the exposition of 1860 was really condemned or not."

The answer from Rome bears date Aug. 30th, 1866, and made it evident that the exposition of 1860 had been included in the former decisions, and that the two professors must acquiesce *ex animo*, as it became them. It was communicated in December to the Rector and Professors of Louvain, and they—such of them as were concerned—subscribed and delivered to the bishops a formula declaratory of their perfect submission.

In the letter of Card. Patrizi, of Aug. 30th, occurs the sentence, "*non sine admiratione auditum est hujusmodi dubitationes fuisse propositas*," which may be thus fairly translated: "it is not without surprise that we have heard that doubts of this kind have been raised," that is, by MM. Beelen and Lefebve, as to the condemnation of the exposition of 1860. It is quite clear that it would have been better if there had been no further question after the decree of March, 1866. Still there was nothing in that or the previous decree to prevent such a doubt as that of the two professors from arising: nor yet in the letter of June 3rd; and, as has been intimated above, they seem to have had some of the bishops to share their uncertainty. At any rate, they were honestly expressing an honest opinion, and went the right way to have their doubt cleared up. If they were wrong, the worst

that can be said of them is that they were under a mistake. There is absolutely no evidence whatever on which to base a more serious charge.

The above statement of facts from the published documents, and the acts of submission of the Professors of Louvain, afford a convincing proof of their docility and obedience to the Holy See, and a striking refutation of the accusations made against them on the faith of the self-same documents. Let the reader compare it with the "Little Summary of the Louvain Ontological Condemnation," contributed to the *Westminster Gazette* (Dec. 7, 1867), and then test the two accounts by the evidence of the documents (DUBLIN REVIEW, Jan. 1868, pp. 279 *et seq.*, and also above), and he will find that the "Little Summary" sadly disfigured the entire history; that it preserved throughout a tone and style of language most unsuited to the subject, and that proceedings and conduct of a nature to console and edify have been grievously misrepresented. But he will not find in those documents any evidence to prove that the authorities of Louvain were wanting in perfect docility of mind and heart: and he will be astonished and pained that the writer of that "Summary" should, even after his mistake was pointed out, have continued to pursue the eminent professors and the "celebrated University," as Pius IX. styles it, of Louvain, with unrelenting hostility.

The reader will observe that I have avoided entering into details further than was necessary to defend the Louvain professors and to correct misstatements. For additional information he must refer to the documents, which, now that they have been made public, enable us to check hostile or idle rumours, and also afford a light and guidance, which every right-minded student of philosophical questions will appreciate. Still it should be borne in mind that the decrees of 1843-4 were not published for twenty years, and that both they and the later decrees of 1864 and 1866 were ultimately made public, contrary to the wishes and without the authorization of the Holy See, which had required that they should be kept secret. This is an important fact, for it shows with what consideration the Holy See has treated M. Ubaghs and his fellow-professors, and also its intentions in their regard; viz., that they should "correct," "amend," "elucidate," "explain," loose, incautious, and equivocal statements of doctrine, which, contrary to the intentions of the authors, "*forte in alienos sensus torqueri possent*," and "*absque periculo tradi non possunt*;" but not to condemn the Louvain teaching as simply unsound and false, or to inflict a public, or theological censure, or to place their works on the Index of prohibited books. The documents, from first to last, require this interpretation, and to any cautious and accurate reader offer no ground for the rash, exaggerated, and erroneous interpretations forced on them. Interpreted fairly, these documents are of the highest value, and every properly disposed Catholic will accept them in a spirit of thankful and implicit submission to their guidance; interpreted unfairly, they are made the vehicle for propagating the dictates of private judgment under the guise of the Church's supreme decisions.

III. To turn now to the question of the condemnation of ontologism.

In the DUBLIN REVIEW for January (p. 236) you stated it as your belief that ontologism is condemned by the Church. Let us, therefore, inquire what evidence there is for this opinion.

1. In 1861 the Holy Office condemned seven propositions, which you gave (*ibid.*), and which are by some maintained to be the principles of ontologism, while others, along with the ontologists themselves, maintain the contrary.

2. In 1866 the Cardinals of the Holy Office and the Index declared that in the works of the ontologist Professor Ubaghs there were taught doctrines very like (*plane similes*) to some of the propositions referred to above, and censured as not to be safely taught; that other opinions also were set forth incautiously (*minus caute quam fas esset*), and that therefore they cannot be taught without danger.

3. In 1862 the ontologist M. Branchereau submitted fifteen propositions to the Holy Office, and Cardinal Patrizi replied that they included some propositions almost the same as some of the propositions reprobated in 1861. It appears that two members of the Roman tribunal were deputed to examine the propositions, and that on their report the Cardinal Secretary based the declaration of his letter, but that no official document was issued. (See *Réponse aux Lettres d'un Sensualiste*, by l'Abbé Jules Fabre, p. 48.)

4. In 1866 the Holy See refused to ratify the election of M. Hugonin to the See of Bayeux until he had retracted the doctrine set forth by him on ontologism, "forasmuch as it especially, whether explicitly or implicitly, favours the propositions" decreed in 1861 to be unsafe.

These historical facts, and the arguments of those who strive to establish the identity of ontologism with the seven condemned propositions, are the evidence put forward for the condemnation of the former along with the latter in 1861, and in the later acts.

Let us now turn to the evidence on the other side.

1. The act which condemns the seven propositions makes no mention of ontologism.

2. In 1862 the Archbishop of Tours, Monsig. Guibert, visited Rome, and at the request of the Bishop of Nantes, in whose seminary ontologism was taught, "interrogated a great many prelates, the best informed and the most competent in these matters, and particularly those who were in the best position for knowing the meaning and the object of the judgment pronounced. All expressed their conviction that the intention of the Pope and the Sacred Congregation was not to interfere with the opinions taught in the schools, and known by the name of ontologism." This he gathered, he says, "from the surest and best-authorized sources." As to the doctrine itself, it was clear to him that men were divided at Rome as elsewhere. "It is not to be supposed," he adds, "that ontologism has ever been the object of censure by the Holy See." Monsig. Guibert was the bearer of M. Branchereau's propositions, the qualification of which, as was mentioned above, has been construed into a total condemnation of ontologism.

3. Another French bishop, Monseigneur Doney, wrote in 1864: "These propositions have been called ontological either by their authors or by those who combat them. Hence somebody has presumed to conclude that the Congregation had condemned all ontologism. The conclusion is manifestly false and unjust."

4. Ontologism, in the true sense of the term, has been explained, defended,

approved, and published in Rome since the act of 1861, no less than before, by Vercellone, Rignano, Ceni, and others, and in the Institutions of Cardinal Gerdil, which were brought out in 1867. I will not enter into particulars already given in the *Westminster Gazette* (Feb. 8, 15), but will instead quote some lines from a pamphlet of Professor Ceni, published in 1867 at Rome. "If we affirm," he says, "that we see God, or in other words, that we perceive Him intellectually, we do so because we are forced by logic and the authority of the Holy Fathers and Doctors, as well as by Divine Revelation, to confess that God is the Truth. . . . The Platonian ontologism was preserved, corrected, and held in honour by the Greek Fathers of the Christian school of Alexandria, and by many of the Latin Fathers down to S. Augustine, who developed and perfected it. . . . This ontologism, at a period not far from our own, when the sensualist theories of Locke had corrupted all philosophy, was recalled to life and cultivated with great ability by the most eminent Cardinal Sigismond Gerdil, whose name will ever resound with glory no less in the Church than in science: it is this ontologism that another remarkable Barnabite, P. Gaetano Milone, has quite recently set forth with great talent and complete scientific evidence. . . . There exist especially for the use of ecclesiastics, many treatises of philosophy, composed by Catholic masters endowed with very short speculative vision, in which, under the name of S. Thomas, Catholics are presented with nothing better than the sensualist theories of Aristotle. To show that the sensitive soul is the same as the intellectual, P. Tongiorgi has not hesitated to give as a reason that 'the intellect obtains the intelligible elements only in the objects presented by the senses.' From this we might conclude that we can know nothing but sensible objects, and that by means of an intelligible light proceeding from them. For my part, I believe a sensualist and a pantheist would find this principle of human knowledge very much in harmony with their theories."

"I am astonished," he continues, "after all the labours of the Fathers, to see Catholic masters, with the experience of the most serious injury done to Christian philosophy by the sensualism of Locke, continue to work in the same direction with the intention of effecting an opposite result. I am very much astonished to see how some Catholic professors, who boast of having restored philosophy, set before us nothing but Aristotelianism, when they explain the theory of cognition. The consequence is, that, with no advantage to science, but to its great detriment, we have got in exchange sensualism and an antiquated empiricism. If any one wish to know better this state of things, and to examine it with his own eyes, let him read the *Compendium* of Sanseverino. He will find the theory of Aristotle almost word for word, in spite of the excellent intention of the writer to keep close to S. Thomas. He has not sought out the principles in which the Angelic Doctor has established the constituents of knowledge, and he has not manifested the scientific result in which that great philosopher clearly shuns the sensualism of Aristotle. Such are the theories offered to Catholic youth. And we are astonished that hardly anybody values philosophy, and that our age is so prone to infidelity! Can such a philosophy serve as an introduction to the sublime speculations of revealed truth? Would not a doubtful ontologism be worth

more than a psychologism that entails dangers so serious and so certain?" —(*Apud Fabre, Cours ii.* pp. 555-561.)

Can further evidence be wanted to establish that the condemnation of ontologism is not believed in even at Rome? Is not the testimony of Monsig. Guibert equal to official evidence that no such condemnation exists? But every point of evidence that evinces that ontologism is not condemned, likewise proves that it is not identical with the seven propositions. If "the best-informed and most competent prelates" in Rome—if "the surest and best-authorized sources" informed Monsig. Guibert, who was asking for guidance in a practical matter of the highest moment, that the Pope and the Cardinals of the Holy Office had not intended to touch ontologism, they thereby informed him that ontologism is not the doctrine of the seven propositions, which they had censured. They said "it was pantheism that they had in view and wished to strike," just as the Bishop of Nantes believed from the first. Now, putting together this conclusive evidence and F. Kleutgen's assertion, that the first, fourth, and fifth of the seven condemned propositions are "purely ontologic, and in themselves foreign to pantheism," we shall obtain this curious result, that those three condemned propositions are not condemned! This result F. Kleutgen and those who with him contend for the condemnation of ontologism cannot escape, except by either rejecting the evidence obtained at Rome, or by abandoning their own position. Which horn of the dilemma they will choose it is for them to determine. I do not think that any one will plead that ontologism and the three propositions just now specified were condemned unintentionally. That would not be respectful to the Roman authorities, and would be somewhat absurd.

Neither would it be approved by Roman and other ontologists, nor yet by many philosophers and critics, who do not trouble themselves about ontologism. The former prove that there is no such thing in existence as the condemnation of ontologism, by the fact of continuing to propagate it under the very eyes of the Pope, and treating the doctrine opposed to it with no more respect than I have done. We have seen Professor Ceni's estimate of psychologism. It is the same as my own.

But what I have said provides the clue to the disapprobation of MM. Branchereau, Ubachs, and Hugonin. It shows that it was not ontologism *per se* that was objected to in their works; in other words, that it was the opinions of individual ontologists, not ontologism, that fell under censure. The argument founded on their fate to prove ontologism condemned is a fallacy *ab accidente*.

But I do not intend to leave the question of the condemnation of ontologism here, but rather to demonstrate that a comparison of the seven propositions with the principles of ontologism is no less decisive against our adversaries than is the testimony of witnesses and facts. To this end I will contrast the first of those propositions with the tenets of ontologists. That proposition by its terms permits and requires the following interpretation:—An immediate (*i. e. facie ad faciem*, and unconditional, actual) knowledge of God, at least habitual, or, God's immediate knowledge (of Himself and of all things in Himself, inasmuch as their being and substance are His being and substance) is of the essence of the human intellect; so that, except by

it, it can know nothing ; since this knowledge is the light of the intellect (and with it the intellect possesses all possible knowledge).

Such is the extravagant significance of this equivocal and treacherous proposition, whether it is considered by itself or with its fellows. Ontologism, on the contrary, contradicts each and every statement of this strange thesis, and teaches that we do not perceive the intrinsic essence of God ; that our perception of Him is not *facie ad faciem* ; that it is conditional or mediate, though not through intermediate or vicarious ideas, which are neither the absolute truths themselves nor subjective forms of the soul, but certain intermediate created entities, which represent the absolute intelligible truths to the soul. It teaches that our perception of the primary principles, metaphysical and moral, and of the eternal archetypal reasons of created things, though intuitive, is not innate but acquired, and depends on sensitive experience of things whose being and substance are finite and essentially distinct from the being of God, as on its previous exciting cause, or rather condition ; that those principles and ideas or reasons are not abstracted or inferred, in any proper sense of the terms, from the objects of sensation, but are latent in the mind, awaiting its apprehension and recognition, from its origin. It teaches that this perception is not essential to man's intellect, but that it is the *use* of intellect, or reason, which can be accounted for scientifically in no other way. It teaches that man has not God's immediate knowledge of Himself, and of all other things in Himself, but that he knows God directly in the intelligible ideas of His being and attributes, which reside in His essence and manifest Him *ad extra* to the mind, which thus, as S. Thomas says, participates in the divine light ; and that he knows creatures experimentally by direct sensitive perception of them severally according to their distinct kinds, and intellectually, by the union with this sensitive knowledge of the knowledge of their eternal archetypes, which are seen in God, and according to which we judge of all things, "*in quantum per participationem sui luminis omnia cognoscimus et dijudicamus. Nam et ipsum lumen naturale rationis participatio quaedam est divini luminis.*" (S. Thom. p. 1, q. 12, art. 11, ad 3^o.) Ontologism further teaches that we can have an experimental knowledge of creatures without knowing them intellectually ; that the intuitive perception of absolute intelligible ideas does not involve all knowledge either of God or of creatures ; that we can attain to some of those ideas without thereby knowing them all, and also without explicitly recognizing them as existing in God, or involving the existence of God, the only absolute, infinite, uncreated, and eternal Being.

Can this teaching, which explicitly, I repeat, contradicts the first, nay, *all* those seven condemned propositions, and imposes so many qualifications and restrictions, where they have nothing of the kind, be identified with, or proved to contain those propositions by any process of sound reasoning ? In other words, can we, with a German philosopher, establish the equality of *something* and *nothing*, or, with F. Kleutgen, that of the part and the whole ? Reason says not, and thus summarily disposes of the latter's laborious efforts. But some one may conceive that the "*Ontologisme jugé par la Sainte-Siège*" should not be dealt with so briefly. Is it, then, essential to follow the arguments of a writer in detail, and refute them singly, when we can show before-

hand, by one simple process, that his reasoning *must* be fallacious from the very nature of the case? I have indeed elsewhere (*Westminster Gazette*, Feb. 29) examined some of F. Kleutgen's proofs, and will gladly continue the task should it appear necessary or desirable to do so; but the limits of a single letter like the present forbid any such undertaking. The one single argument, then, that I have given, must suffice for the refutation of the work named.

The doctrine of ontologism is, then, very different from that of the seven propositions, and is not involved in their condemnation. Neither is it at variance with the teaching of S. Thomas. According to him, the divine light is the light by which, "*in hac vita*," we know and judge of all things, and in virtue of which "*omnia dicimus in Deo videre et secundum ipsum de omnibus judicare*." Those who aim at overthrowing ontologism must not invoke the aid of S. Thomas any more than of S. Augustine, S. Anselm, S. Bonaventure, and the other great lights of Christian philosophy; a truth in which you are agreed, Mr. Editor, as your January number (p. 237) shows. I cannot, however, allow your statement that the third tenet quoted from Herr Schütz "would be accounted by ordinary ontologists as their fundamental tenet." My reason appears above. Further, Herr Schütz, by maintaining "the existence of a faculty of intuition" of absolute ideas is himself an ontologist, and will not refute "the claim of the ontologist school to represent S. Augustine." Had he and others taken proper pains to *understand* ontologism, they would not have failed to accept it, or to recognize it as their own doctrine; at any rate, they could not have deemed it involved in the condemnation of the seven pantheistic propositions censured in 1861, or in the condemnation of particular authors for doctrines like to those propositions. What, then, is the state of the case? For the condemnation of ontologism we have nothing but gratuitous assertions, and arguments, which we know, from the nature of the question, *must* be fallacious: against it, the decisive evidence of witnesses and facts, and the manifest difference between ontologism and the doctrine which is condemned. Contradictions cannot be involved in one common condemnation.

I remain, Sir,
Yours faithfully,

VINDEX.

POSTSCRIPT.—Allow me to add a few words in regard to the third condemned proposition, as, in what I have before said, it is not specially provided for. That proposition is as follows:—"Universals considered objectively (*a parte rei*) are not distinguished really from God." There is here a manifest ambiguity; for universals considered objectively mean either created universals, *i.e.* finite genera and species, or the uncreated reasons, exemplars, ideas, or types of creatures, which exist in the Divine Mind. If, then, we assert simply and universally that objective universals are not really distinct from God, we confound the being of God and of creatures, and teach pantheism. And this it is that the second and third condemned propositions do, although the one affirms it in the one form, the other in the other. Hence those propositions were declared *unsafe*, owing, I should suppose, to

their ambiguity, which permits the pantheistic interpretation, and nothing more than unsafe, because, with the proper distinctions, they are sound.

Now ontologists make the required distinctions. They teach that universals considered in God (*a parte Dei*) are not really, but only virtually, distinct from Him ; but that universals considered in creatures (*a parte creaturarum*) are really distinct from God.

To prove that universals are known in the former sense no less than in the latter, besides advancing other reasons, they adduce S. Thomas, who teaches that "we are said to see all things in God, and to judge of all things according to Him. . . . by participation in His light," yet without seeing the essence of God (1, q. 12, a. 11, 3), and that "the intellective soul knows all truths in the eternal reasons ; that in the Divine Mind exist the reasons of all creatures, according to which all things are formed, and according to which also the soul of man knows all things," &c. (1, q. 84, a. 5.) In the latter place, as in the former, the Angelic Doctor is speaking of man "*in statu presentis vitae*." He further writes, with S. Augustine, "*ratio superior est quae intendit aeternis conspiciendis, aut consulendis ; conspiciendis quidem quod ea in seipsis speculatur. . . . Ratio vero inferior intendit temporibus rebus. Haec autem duo, scilicet temporalia et aeterna, comparantur ad cognitionem nostram hoc modo quod unum eorum est medium ad cognoscendum alterum*," &c. (1, q. 79, a. 9.) If I had space, I would continue the quotation, and also adduce q. 79, a. 12, to prove that the intellect apprehends the eternal reasons of things, and principles speculative and practical, intuitively or *in seipsis*, and does not come at them by reasoning or abstractions properly so called, but that previous sensation is necessary as a means or condition for such intuition. Of course S. Thomas does not regard the eternal reasons and principles as pure mental forms, or as really distinct from God. He therefore asserts for the intellect, as ontologists do, an intuitive, but not immediate or unconditional, knowledge of eternal intelligible ideas, or universals, which exist in the essence of God, and are virtually, not really, distinct from it.

INDEX.

ACTA QUÆ APUD SANCTAM SEDEM GERUNTUR, *noticed*, 235.
 Allocution pronounced by Pope Pius IX., 20 Nov. 1867, *reviewed*, 210.
 Anderdon (Rev. W. H.) Sunday Afternoons with the Saints, *noticed*, 277.
 — Confession to a Priest, *noticed*, 277.
 — In the Snow, *noticed*, 277.

BERNARD (Abbé), *Les voyages de S. Jerome*, *reviewed*, 395.
 Beste (F. Kenelm D.), *Victories of Rome*, *noticed*, 543.
 Brame (C. M.), *Tales from the Diary of a Sister of Mercy*, *noticed*, 563.
 Bruce (Right Hon. H. A.) *Speech on Education of the Poor Bill*, *reviewed*, 131.

CARDELLA (P. Valeriano), *Giulio Watts Russell*, *noticed*, 541.
 Carlyle (Thomas), *Shooting Niagara*, *noticed*, 245.
 CASE (THE) OF IRELAND BEFORE PARLIAMENT, 498-518 : Mr. Gladstone's declaration regarding Fenianism, 498 ; Sketch of the history of Fenianism, 499 ; Lord Kimberley's administration, 499-502 ; Lord Abercorn's government, 502-508 ; the general result an Irish policy on the part of all leading statesmen, 508 ; the Government policy, 509 ; Mr. Gladstone's policy, 510 ; Earl Russell's policy, 511 ; Earl Grey's policy, 512 ; Mr. Bright's policy, 513 ; Mr. Mill's policy, 513-515 ; want of harmony in the Opposition policy, 515 ; Archbishop Manning's Letter to Earl Grey, 516, 517 ; the attitude of the Irish Catholics, 518.
 Catholic Education, a Report, *noticed*, 523.
 Catholic Directory for 1868, *noticed*, 278.
 CHAMPAGNY (LE COMTE DE) *LES ANTONINS*, *reviewed*, 362.
 Chatterton (Lady), Oswald of Deira, *noticed*, 278.
 Children's Employment Commission Reports, *reviewed*, 131.
 Chocarne (F., O. P.), *Inner Life of F. Lacordaire*, *noticed*, 240.
Chronicle (The) and Catholic Minimism, 46.
 Comedy (The) of Convocation, *noticed*, 254.
 Copernicus and Ptolemy, 274.

DEVOTIONS FOR ADVENT AND CHRISTMAS, *noticed*, 557.
 Devotions for Lent and Passiontide, *noticed*, 557.
 Discourse of Pope Pius IX., 24 Feb. 1868, *noticed*, 519.
 DOCTRINAL APOSTOLIC LETTERS, 84-130 : Limit of direct controversy with F. Ryder, 84, 85 ; objections of certain Catholics, 85 ; reply, 86, 87 ; VOL. X.—NO. XX. [New Series.]

scope of the present discussion, 88, 89 ; many apostolic letters, not being Bulls, contain doctrinal instruction, 89, 90 ; Thesis I., the doctrinal instruction of an Encyclical addressed to all [bishops is infallible, 90-92 ; objections considered, 92-94 ; illustrations, S. Leo's Letter to S. Flavian, 94, 95 ; S. Hormisdas's Letter to Possessor, 95, 96 ; a further objection considered, 96-99 ; Thesis II., every doctrinal Act is infallible which is issued in a general form, 99 ; Thesis III., The Syllabus furnishes an infallible rule of belief, 99-101 ; Thesis IV., All the Pontifical Acts from which the Syllabus was compiled were issued *ex cathedrâ*, 101-103 ; Thesis V., All Apostolic Letters of which the Pope directs the publication are *ex cathedrâ*, 103 ; Thesis VI., All Apostolic Letters are *ex cathedrâ* whenever not intended for the special benefit of those formally addressed, 105 ; Thesis VII., All Acts are *ex cathedrâ* in which the Pope pronounces some doctrine heretical or unsound, 106 ; Dr. Murray's argument on this point, 106 ; Benedict XIV.'s Apostolic Letter "Suprema," 107-109 ; all doctrinal Acts are *ex cathedrâ* which contain certain officially significant words, 109 ; objection that the Holy Father is never infallible unless he is formally addressing the whole Church, 109-114 ; reasonable doubt may, however, exist in certain cases, 114 ; testimony of theologians, 116-126 ; two objections which have been urged against the truth of our general doctrine considered, 126-130.

ECCE HOMO, *reviewed*, 177.

Eccles (Canon), On Justification, *noticed*, 250.

Essays on Religion and Literature, *noticed*, 229.

Estcourt (Canon), Dogmatic Teaching of Book of Common Prayer, *noticed*, 533.

Eyre (Mgr.) History of S. Cuthbert, 44.

FALLOUX (Count de), Life and Letters of Madame Swetchine, *noticed*, 244.

FIRST AGE (THE) OF THE MARTYR CHURCH, 362-395 : The Roman world unconscious that there is a sacred order of moral truth, 362, 363 ; this truth connected in Christianity with a person, 363, 364 ; subject of the present study, 364 ; essentially national character of the Jewish religion, 364, 365 ; Christian religion on the contrary, universal, 365, 366 ; characters of the Christian life during its first ten generations, 366 ; the Christians during and immediately after the Apostolic age, 367 ; policy of the Empire towards Christianity in this period, 368 ; Nero's persecution, 369 ; the legal distinction between Christianity and other creeds, 370 ; Domitian's persecution, 371 ; the reigns of Tiberius, Trajan, and Hadrian, 372 ; wide spread of Christianity in the time of Antoninus, 373 ; organization of the Church, 374 ; S. Ignatius, 374, 375 ; the unity and sovereignty of the Church, 375, 376 ; beginnings of heresy, 377 ; the unity of government and faith, 378, 379 ; Trajan's policy towards the Christians, 380-382 ; Trajan's meeting with S. Ignatius, 383 ; journey of S. Ignatius to Rome, and his martyrdom,

384, 385 ; the principate of Hadrian, 386 ; the martyrdom of Symphorosa and her seven sons, 387-389 ; the apology of Justin Martyr, 389, 390 ; the testimony of Celsus, 391 ; Hadrian's rescript, 391, 392 ; a Roman emperor's view of Christianity, 393, 394 ; formation of the Christian character by martyrdom, 394, 395.

Formby (Rev. H.), Cause of Catholic Emigrants, *noticed*, 258.

Francis (S., of Assisi), Life of, *noticed*, 562.

Freppel (Abbé), Saint Cyprien, *reviewed*, 165.

Froude (Rev. R. H.), History of the Contest between Thomas à Becket and Henry II., *reviewed*, 60, 458.

GALLERANI (F., S. J.), Sermon on the Infallible Character of the Syllabus, 118

Gilbert (Rev. D., D.D.), Love of Jesus, *noticed*, 558.

Greenwell (Miss), Lacordaire, *noticed*, 536.

HEGENRÖTHER (Dr.), Photius, *noticed*, 538.

IRISH (The) Ecclesiastical Record, *noticed*, 262.

JEROME (SAINT), 395-430 : The century of Patritic classics, 395, 396 ; departure of S. Jerome from Rome, 396, 397 ; his birth-place, 397, 398 ; his education at Rome, 398, 399 ; he sets out for the East, 399 ; his life in the desert, 400-403 ; his residence at Antioch, 403 ; becomes Secretary to Pope Damasus, 403 ; translates the New Testament, 404 ; leaves Rome, 405 ; arrives at Jerusalem with Paula, 406 ; state of Jerusalem, 407 ; arrival at Bethlehem, 408 ; his relation to his age, 409 ; monastic life at Bethlehem, 410, 411 ; letter to Marcella, 411-413 ; the Saint's work on the Holy Scriptures, 413-417 ; his commentaries, 417-420 ; the quarrel with Rufinus, 420-423 ; Helvidius, Jovinian, and Vigilantius, 423, 424 ; S. Jerome's Asceticism, 424-427 ; the death of S. Paula, 427 ; the last days at Bethlehem, 428, 429 ; death, 430.

KAVANAGH (Hon. Mrs.), Instructions for Confession, *noticed*, 562.

Kay (Mr.) on the religious condition England, 14, 15.

LEO's (S.) DOGMATIC LETTER, 489-497 : Leo's letter, the great antidote to Eutychianism, 489 ; undoubtedly ex cathedrâ, 490 ; yet addressed to an individual, Flavian, and not to the universal Church, 490 ; nor are its contents exclusively doctrinal, 490 ; it teaches by way of doctrinal exposition, not of approval or censure of definite proposition, 491 ; nor does it impose the obligation of absolute interior assent, 491, 492 ; text of the letter, 492-497.

Leonis (S.), Magni Epistola, *reviewed*, 489.

Letter in the *Tablet* from a Roman Doctor, *noticed*, 564.

Letter on Professor Ubags and Ontologism, 569.

Letters of a Roman Doctor of Divinity, 269.

Liddon (Henry Parry, M.A.), The Divinity of our Lord, *noticed*, 548.

Life of S. Francis of Assisi, *noticed*, 562.

Lockhart (F. William), Non Possumus, *noticed*, 547.

MAGUIRE'S (J. F., M.P.) Irish in America, *noticed*, 525.

MANNING (ARCHBISHOP) ON THE CENTENARY, 45-60: Special importance among the Archbishop's works of this Pastoral Letter, 45; its full statement of the Papal prerogatives, 46; the Archbishop on Gallicanism, 46-50; the *Saturday Review* on Ultramontanism and naturalism, 50, 51; the authority of the Encyclical and Syllabus, 51-52; the Pope and the Episcopate, 52; functions of the Council, 53; the Church's relations with modern society, 54; expediency of advocating certain doctrines at particular times, 55, 56; the Catholic doctrine on Church and State specially practical at this moment, 57; the Archbishop on the modern tendency to separate Church and State, 58-59; the Holy Father's approval of the Archbishop's Pastoral, 60.

Martiannoy (Dom J.), *La vie de S. Jérôme*, *reviewed*, 395.

Maynard (Abbé), *Voltaire*, *noticed*, 551.

Meynell (Rev. C. D.D.), *Short Sermons*, *noticed*, 253.

Migne (J. P.), *S. Hieronymi Opera*, *reviewed*, 395.

MONTALEMBERT'S (COUNT DE) MONKS OF THE WEST, 1-44: Great attractiveness of Count de Montalembert's character, 1; his family and personal history, 2; special interest of the last three volumes of his history to Englishmen, 3; comparison of his work with that of Hume, and Macaulay, 3-5; England and her saints, 6-8; the old devotion to S. Cuthbert, 8, 9; the revived devotion to S. Wilfrid, 10; M. de Montalembert's preposterous panegyric of the English character, 11-14; England considered as "the most religious of all European nations," 14; Mr. Kay's evidence on that subject, 15; other authorities to the same effect, 15, 16; M. de Montalembert's sketch of Northumbria, 16, 17; state of Britain before its conversion, 18, 19; character of S. Columba, 20, 21; mission of S. Augustine, 22; the churches of Canterbury, London, and Rochester, 23; M. de Montalembert on miracles, 24, 25; conversion of King Edwin of Northumbria, 25, 26; character of Oswald, 27; reign of Oswy, 28; monastic character of the early English Church, 28, 29; King Ina, 30; the English College at Rome, 31; Princesses who became religious, 31; S. Hilda of Whitby, 32; Cædmon, 33, 34; the mission of S. Wilfrid, 35; claims of Protestantism to historical antiquity, 36; the Celtic rule of keeping Easter, 37, 38; S. Wilfrid's way with the Celtic customs, 39; M. de Montalembert's character of S. Wilfrid, 40-43; S. Cuthbert's cathedral at Durham, 44.

Montalembert (Le Comte de) *Les Moines d'Occident*, *revised*, 1.

Morris (Canon) *Life and Martyrdom of S. Thomas*, *reviewed*, 60, 458.

NARY (Rev. J.), *Our Church Music*, *noticed*, 540.

Newman (John Henry, D.D.), *Verses on various occasions*, *noticed*, 531.

Nicolas (Auguste), *The Divinity of Christ*, *noticed*, 246.

OAKELEY (Canon), *A Few Words on Church Choirs*, *noticed*, 264.

Oakeley (Canon), *Church Choirs and Church Music*, *noticed*, 540.

Oxford Question (The) *Pastorals on*, 224.

PASTORALS OF THE ENGLISH BISHOPS ON THE OXFORD QUESTION, *noticed*, 224.

Perrone (F., S. J.), L'Ermesianismo, *noticed*, 232.

Pius IX., Discourse of, *noticed*, 519.

POPULAR EDUCATION IN ENGLAND, 131-165; Popular Education become the watchword of the Liberal party, 131, 132; Earl Russell's resolutions, 133; the two systems and the Conscience Clause, 134; strength of the opposed parties, 135; position and power of Catholics, 136; criminal statistics of England, 137, 138; Pauperism, 139; statistics of Education, 139-142; evidence from the Children's Employment Commission of the general ignorance of children, 142-147; the principles of the Secularist school, 147; views of Mr. Bruce and Lord Russell, 151-153; views of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, 153; the *Saturday Review*, 154; Secularist literature, 155-158; Secularist meetings, 158, 159; consequences of passing a Local Education Rating Bill, 160-161; present tendencies and views of the working classes, 163, 164; duty of Catholics to combine with Anglicans and Wesleyans in educational policy, 164, 165.

REAU (P. du, S. J.), History of Bernard de Quatrebarbes, *noticed*, 541.

Report of Commissioners on Ritualist Practices, *reviewed*, 430.

Report on State of Popular Education, *reviewed*, 131.

RITUALISTS (THE), 430-458: Mr. Keble's sermon on National Apostacy, 430, 431; Ritualism, a phrase of the movement of 1833, 431; religious revival in England, 431, 432; absurd use of the word "Catholic" by Ritualists, 432, 433; being as much Protestants as Evangelicals or Methodists, 434; Mr. Bennett's evidence, 435-437; Ritualism and the working classes, 438; the Ritualists and Tractarians in relation to the Prayer Book, 439-442; in relation to Bishops, 442; the Gorham and Denison cases, 444, 445; a National Synod, 445, 446; the *Church Times* on Bishops, 446-448; the Ritualist organs, 448, 449; Mr. Bennett on the Sacraments, 449; Convocation, 450; growth of Ritualism, 451; Ritualism in its relation to Catholics, 452; Ritualist imputations against Catholic converts, 456-458; note to this article, 568.

Rodwell (Rev. J. M.), *Æthiopic Liturgies and Prayers*, *reviewed*, 320.

— *Æthiopic Prayers and Baptismal Offices*, *reviewed*, 320.

Roman Documents on a Philosophical Controversy in Belgium, 279.

ROME AND THE REVOLUTION, 210-223; Review of the state of Rome after departure of the French, 210, 211; invasion of the Roman States and conduct of the soldiers of the Pope, 212; the Pope's clemency, 213; the Catholic reaction in France, 213, 214; diplomatic correspondence of the French and Italian Governments, 215-218; great decline in the Emperor's power during last year, 218; the debate in the French Corps Législatif, 219-221; defeat of the Menabrea Ministry in the Italian Parliament, 221; state of Italian affairs, 222; prospects of the coming year, 222, 223.

Ryder (H. J. D., of the Oratory), *Idealism in Theology, reviewed*, 84.

— *Letter to the Tablet, noticed*, 564.

— *A Letter to W. G. Ward, D.Ph., noticed*, 566.

SCHÜTZ (N. L.), *Commentatio Philosophica, noticed*, 235.

SECOND MAN (The) *VERIFIED IN HISTORY*, 177-210 ; the giving of the Spirit the result of the Incarnation of the Son, 177-180 ; its generic character, 180 ; its differential marks, 181 ; qualities which it bestows, 182-186 ; three analogies illustrating it, 186-190 ; historical fulfilment of the above doctrine, 190 ; actual creation of the Divine society, 190-195 ; mode of the Truth's transmission in it, 195-199 ; transmission of Truth connects it with imparting of grace, 199-205 ; this mode of transmitting Truth enjoined by our Lord, 205-207 ; result a divine life embracing the intellect and the will, 207-210.

Smith (Rev. W. D.) *Book of Moses, noticed*, 528.

TABLET (The), *Letters of a Roman Doctor of Divinity, noticed*, 269.

Tablet, Letter to, from a Roman Doctor, noticed, 564.

Theologians cited on the Infallible Character of Apostolic Letters, 118.

Thiel (Andreas), *Epistola Romanorum Pontificum, noticed*, 251.

Thierry (A.), *Saint Jerome, reviewed*, 395

, S. Jérôme, *noticed*, 554.

THOMAS (S.) OF CANTERBURY, 60-84 : Pre-eminence of S. Thomas among the English Saints, 60 ; difficulty of obtaining a clear view of his character, 61 ; Mr. Froude's view of his conduct when Chancellor, 61, 62 ; the Saint's birth and his parents, 63, 64 ; his early years, and life in the world, 65, 66 ; appointed Archbishop, 66, 67 ; his life at Canterbury, 68, 69 ; commencement of the contest with Henry, 70 ; character of Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of London, 70, 71 ; the Council of Westminster, 72 ; the King's relations to the Saint, 73 ; the Council of Clarendon, 74, 75 ; S. Thomas charged with malversation of the Royal Funds, 75 ; the Council of Northampton, 76-80 ; the Saint's escape from Northampton, 81 ; the question of the ecclesiastical immunities, 82, 83 ; commencement of the Saint's martyrdom, 83, 84.

— , 458-489 : S. Thomas reaches France, 458 ; his delegates and the king's arrive together before the Pope at Sens, 459 ; Gilbert Foliot at Sens, 459-462 ; S. Thomas resigns his see, and retires to Pontigni, 462 ; the exile of his friends and family, 462 ; letters to the king, 463, 464 ; life at Pontigni, 465-467 ; sermon at Vezely, 467 ; letters to the Pope, 468-470 ; interview with the king at Freitval, 470 ; parting with the king of France, 471 ; letters to king Henry, 472, 473 ; letters of John of Salisbury, 473, 474 ; the suspension of the three Bishops, 475 ; the Saint returns to England, 475, 476 ; his arrival at Canterbury, 477 ; goes to London, 478 ; the relics of S. Lawrence, 478, 479 ; trials and warnings, 479-481 ; the assassin barons, 481 ; they arrive at Canterbury, 482 ; interview with the Saint, 482-485 ; they go forth to get armour, 485 ; the martyrdom, 486, 487 ;

the Saint's relations with the king, 487, 488 ; his special character of sanctity, 488, 489.

TIZZANI (Mgr. V.), S. Etienne et S. Cyprien, *reviewed*, 165.

TIZZANI ON S. CYPRIAN, 165-176 : peculiar character of S. Cyprian, 165 ; his works, 166 ; books of Abbé Freppel and Mgr. Tizzani, 167 ; summary of the documents relating to the controversy between S. Cyprian and S. Stephen, 167-171 ; examination of Mgr. Tizzani's argument, 171 ; S. Cyprian's doctrine regarding Baptism, 172, 175 ; Mgr. Tizzani at least partially right, 175, 176.

UBAGHS (THE) CONTROVERSY, 569, 237, 279.

Ullathorne (Bishop), Lectures on the Conventual Life, *noticed*, 525.

Univers (The) of Feb. 24th, *noticed*, 520.

Univers (The) of Feb. 28th, *noticed*, 523.

Vaughan (Herbert, D.D.), Popular Education in England, *noticed*, 523

WARD (W. G., D.Ph.), The Authority of Doctrinal Decisions, *reviewed*, 84.

Ward (W. G., D.Ph.), A Second Letter to the Rev. F. Ryder, *noticed*, 566.

Wellington (F.M. Arthur, Duke of), Despatches, Correspondence, and Memoranda, *reviewed*, 291.

WELLINGTON'S (THE DUKE OF) DESPATCHES, 291-319 ; the Duke's character and civil services, 291 ; nature of his correspondence, 292 ; Sir H. Bulwer's account of Canning's appointment as Foreign Minister, 293-295 ; real history of that transaction, 295-298 ; effect of Mr. Canning's appointment on English and foreign affairs, 298 ; the Duke and Prince Metterinch, 299 ; state of Europe when the Congress of Verona met, 300 ; position and policy of Russia, 301 ; the Czar's designs on Spain, 302 ; the Duke's character of the Spanish nation, 303-306 ; Russia and Turkey, 306-308 ; the Duke and the Irish Catholic bishops, 308 ; Mr. Canning's application to Cardinal Consalvi touching the see of Cashel, 309 ; the Duke's relations with Primate Curtis, 310 ; correspondence between the Duke and Dr. Curtis, 311-318 ; the Duke's opinions and policy in regard to the Catholic Question, 318, 319.

Westminster (Archbishop of) The Centenary of S. Peter, *reviewed*, 45.

Rome and the Revolution, *noticed*, 225.

Christ and Antichrist, *noticed*, 225.

Letter to Canon Oakeley, *noticed*, 540.

Westminster Gazette (The), Roman Correspondence, 60.

White (Henry), Massacre of S. Bartholomew, *noticed*, 559.

WITNESS (THE) OF HERETICAL BODIES TO MARIOLOGY, 320-361 : the relation of Anglicanism to the Fathers, 320 ; effect of the discovery of the writings of S. Clement and S. Ignatius on ecclesiastical history, 321 ; Petavius proves that the Fathers require an interpreter, 322 ; doctrine deduced from the Fathers by certain German and English writers, 322, 323 ; Kühn and Newman, 323, 324 ; recent researches strongly corroborate Roman doctrine, 324, 325 ; *Æthiopic hymn to our Blessed Lady*, 325-329 ; the Abyssinian Church, 329, 330 ; origin of

devotion to the Blessed Virgin in it, 331 ; course of Gnosticism, 332, 333 ; origin of the Patripassians and Sabellians, 334, 335 ; bearing of the Gnostic controversy on the dogma of the Incarnation, 335-337 ; singular clearsightedness of Rome, and her anticipation of subsequent controversies, 337 ; importance of this fact in considering the genuineness and date of documents, 337 ; comparison between the dogmatic language of Hippolytus and of S. Leo, 338 ; another fragment of Hippolytus, 339, 340 ; fragment of S. Melito, 340 ; this Æthiopic hymn is certainly subsequent to the rise of Apollinarianism, 341-344 ; indeed at least as late as the Council of Ephesus, yet earlier than the Council of Chalcedon, 345 ; nor can it have received interpolations at a later period, 345 ; character of the Monophysite heresy, 346 ; nature of their controversy with Catholics, 347, 348 ; the Monophysite symbol, 349 ; Mysticism and Nestorianism, 350 ; the hymn evidently not composed by a Monophysite, 351-353 ; its date is clearly subsequent to the Council of Ephesus, 353-355 ; a vast increase of devotion to our Lady took place throughout the Church just before Eutyches, 355 ; a letter against Paul of Samosata falsely ascribed to S. Dionysius of Alexandria, 356 ; it clearly belongs to the school of Appolinaris, 357-359 ; in all the fallen churches of Asia and Africa, devotion to Mary survives, 360 ; great field of study for English Catholics in the Fathers, 361.

WRANGLER (A.), Theories of Copernicus and Ptolemy, *noticed*, 274.

ZÖCKLER (Dr. Otto), Hieronymus, sein Leben und Wirken, *reviewed*, 395.

